

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

The patronage of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa 1430-1511

Thesis

How to cite:

Norman, Diana (1989). The patronage of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa 1430-1511. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1989 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

DX 78 296

UNRESTRICTED

THE PATRONAGE OF CARDINAL OLIVIERO CARAFA
1430-1511

Diana Norman, Dip. A. D. (Birmingham), B. A. (London), M. A. (London)

A DISSERTATION

in the

HISTORY OF ART

Presented to the Arts Faculty of the Open
University in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy

1989

Author's number: m702091X

Date of submission: 16th March 1989

Date of award: 15th October 1989

The Open University.

Higher Degrees Office

03 APR 1989

EX12

Ack.....

HIGHER DEGREES OFFICE

LIBRARY AUTHORISATION FORM

STUDENT: Diana Norman SERIAL NO: M702091X

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

TITLE OF THESIS: The Patronage of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, 1430-1511

I confirm that I am willing that my thesis be made available to readers
and maybe photocopied, subject to the discretion of the Librarian.

SIGNED: Diana Norman DATE: 16 March 1989

The Patronage of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa (1430-1511)

This thesis studies the patronage of an important Italian Renaissance Cardinal, Oliviero Carafa, a topic relatively neglected in modern scholarship.

It examines his patronage from a number of distinct but inter-related perspectives, namely, his position as a cardinal prince of the church, cardinal protector of the kingdom of Naples, cardinal protector of a number of religious orders, head of the Carafa clan, and patron of a variety of artists and humanist scholars.

In doing so, it examines the historical evidence for Cardinal Carafa's various positions within the College of Cardinals and the papal Curia and the kinds of access they afforded him to a complex patron client network which embraced not merely Rome and Naples but the whole of Italy and Europe. It also investigates the extent and sources of his wealth as holder of multiple sacred offices and the various ways in which he ensured that his relatives shared in such benefits.

In respect of Carafa's role as patron of art and letters, the study analyses and assesses the significance of: Carafa's two funerary chapels (the Carafa chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome and the 'Succorpo' in Naples cathedral), his commission to Bramante for the cloister at Santa Maria della Pace in Rome, his other ecclesiastical and civic foundations, his private residences, his library, his promotion of manuscript production and printing, and his status as the recipient and

dedicatee of a large number of scholarly works. As appropriate to a study of Renaissance patronage, particular emphasis is placed on those areas in which Carafa can plausibly be said to have intervened in the origination and outcome of these artistic and scholarly endeavours.

In exploring these inter-related themes, the study thus throws light upon the structures and processes of Renaissance patronage in Italy. It reiterates the importance of the family as a locale for patronage and, more particularly, demonstrates how a powerfully placed ecclesiastic could contribute decisively to the family's fortunes. It also provides an insight into Renaissance patrons' strong sense of loyalty towards the place of their birth.

Moving beyond Italian Renaissance patronage in general, this study also offers an opportunity to explore the more specific field of Renaissance cardinals' patronage and assesses the complex variety of patronal commitments that Renaissance cardinals characteristically undertook. Furthermore, the case of Oliviero Carafa, an ecclesiastic involved in pluralism, simony, and nepotism and yet also genuinely committed to the reform of such abuses, provides an opportunity to explore some of the moral dilemmas that patronage presented to Carafa and his contemporaries.

The examination of Carafa's patronage of art and letters provides emphatic endorsement of the interest and enthusiasm prevalent amongst Renaissance patrons for classical texts and artefacts. It also calls into question, however, the assumption that such cultural phenomena were

motivated solely by secular appetites. Carafa's artistic commissions were preponderantly religious and therefore entirely conventional for a high-ranking orthodox ecclesiastic. Yet many of them were rendered distinctive by sustained self-conscious allusion to classical prototypes. The literary works produced under his aegis also supply an insight into the special nature of humanist endeavour in Rome where the intellectual traditions of scholasticism and theology provided a decisive input.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has been made possible only with the help of many friends and fellow scholars, and the assistance of several institutions, to all of whom I should like to express my sincere appreciation.

My warmest thanks go to my supervisor, Erika Langmuir, whose continuous encouragement and constructive criticism have helped make the preparation of this dissertation a rewarding experience. To John White I owe a debt for first stimulating my interest in Italian Renaissance art and to Nicolai Rubinstein and David Davies for turning my attention to the topic of Renaissance patronage. For their valuable criticism, suggestions, and advice on early stages of this work, I am grateful to Catherine King and Charles Harrison. I also wish to thank in particular Gerald Parsons, who patiently and helpfully read the manuscript in draft form. For advice, conversation and correspondence on a number of specific points, I have to thank Nicholas Barker, Leonard Boyle O.P., Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, Miriam Foot, John Gash, Elizabeth McGrath, Albinia de la Mare, Pamela Robinson and Ailsa Turner.

I owe much to the Warburg Institute, London, its director and staff who provided the scholarly facilities in which the major part of this study was accomplished. In addition, I am indebted to the staff of the following archives and libraries: in London, the British Library; in Cambridge, the Fitzwilliam Museum, and the University Library; in Oxford, the Bodleian Library; in Rome, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, the Archivio Generale O.P. at

Santa Sabina, the Archivio di Stato, the Biblioteca Nazionale, the Biblioteca Hertziana, the Library at San Clemente, the British School at Rome; in Florence, the Archivio di Stato, the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, the Biblioteca Laurenziana, the Kunsthistorisches Institut. My study in Italy was made possible by several grants from the Open University.

I have published two articles relevant to the subject of this thesis. A section in chapter three which deals with Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's library has appeared in extended form as 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', The Book Collector, XXXVI (1987), pp. 354-371, 471-490. Material from chapter five has been utilised in a selective and re-ordered form as 'The Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples: "empress of all chapels" ', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XLIX (1986), pp. 323-355.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	vi
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Renaissance patronage: Cardinal Carafa in the context of recent debates	
II THE BIOGRAPHY OF CARDINAL OLIVIERO CARAFA (1430-1511).....	21
Family, education and early career Cardinal of Naples Relations with the Medici Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order Cardinal Protector of other religious orders Carafa and reform Wealth and reputation	
III CARAFA AND RENAISSANCE HUMANISM.....	98
The library Patron of manuscript production and early printing Carafa's patronage of scholars Pasquino Carafa and Greek scholarship Carafa and sacred oratory	
IV THE CARAFA CHAPEL AT SANTA MARIA SOPRA MINERVA.....	169
The commission The vault The altar wall The west wall: the upper mural The west wall: the lower mural The east wall The painted framework The tomb chamber The chapel's functions	

	Page
Chapter	
V THE CHAPEL OF THE SUCCORPO.....	283
The relics of Saint Januarius	
The commission	
The site	
The tomb	
The ceiling	
The patron's statue	
Original setting and decorative framework	
The mural reliefs	
The functions of the Succorpo	
VI OTHER PROJECTS IN ROME.....	327
The convent of Santa Maria della Pace	
The cloister of the Cisterna	
San Lorenzo fuori le Mura	
Other churches in Rome	
The villa on the Quirinal	
The Palazzo Orsini	
VII OTHER PROJECTS IN NAPLES.....	380
Carafa palaces and chapels	
The Duomo and Archbishop's Palace	
The hospital at San Gennaro <u>extra moenia</u>	
The Sapienza	
VIII CONCLUSION.....	406
TABLES.....	434
APPENDICES.....	438
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	448

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures

1. Plan of the Carafa chapel and tomb chamber, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
2. Diagram of the vault of the tomb chamber, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
3. Plan of the chapel of the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples, showing the position of the major fittings.
4. Plan of the church and conventual buildings, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
5. North elevation of the cloister and conventual buildings, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
6. Reconstruction of the upper north and west cloister walkways, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
7. Plan of the Villa Carafa-Este, c. 1568, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
8. Sixteenth-century ground floor plan, south and west wings, Palazzo Orsini, Rome, Archivio di Stato, Rome, Mappe I, c. 87, no. 565.
9. First floor plan, Palazzo Orsini, Rome, dated 8 Mar., 1721, Archivio di Stato, Rome, Mappe I, c. 87, no. 567.

Plates

1. Final page (fol. 4v) of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's will, showing the names of the witnesses, Archivio storico diocesano, Naples.
2. Title page of Antonio de Butrio, In quantum librum Decretalium, copied between 1458 and 1467 by Hermann of Münster for Oliviero Carafa, Archbishop of Naples, ex library Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
3. Explicit of Antonio de Butrio, In quantum librum Decretalium, showing the signature of Hermann of Münster.
4. Title page of Domenico di San Gimignano, Recolleste super libris 3. 4. et 5. Sexti Libri Decretum, copied between 1458 and 1467 by Peter Schell of Cologne for Oliviero Carafa, Archbishop of Naples, ex library Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
5. Explicit of Domenico di San Gimignano, Recolleste super libris Decretum, showing the signature of Peter Schell.

6. The front cover of Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, Commentaria in libros Aristotelis de anima (Rome, 1509), bound for Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, ex library Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
7. Title page of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's personal copy of Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, De anima, ex library Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
8. Title page of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's personal copy of Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, Additiones in libros analyticorum Aristotelis (Venice, 1505), ex library Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
9. Dedication page of Benedetto Maffei, Epithoma in libros Plinii historiae naturalis, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5874, fol. 1^r.
10. 'Pasquino' - Menelaus carrying the body of Patroclus, eroded torso, Hellenistic, 2nd century B. C., corner of Palazzo Braschi, formerly Orsini, Rome.
11. 'Pasquino' - Menelaus, detail of Plate 10.
12. 'Pasquino', engraving for Antonio Lafréry, Speculum Romanae magnificentiae (Rome, 1550).
13. 'Pasquino', woodcut, frontispiece to Carmina ad Pasquillum posita M. D. XL (Rome, 1511).
14. The Carafa chapel from the south transept, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
15. The entrance arch of the Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
16. View of the altarpiece and The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, c. 1488-93, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
17. Filippino Lippi, The Annunciation with Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and Saint Thomas Aquinas, c. 1488-93, fresco altarpiece, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
18. Filippino Lippi, The Assumption, upper composition, c. 1488-1493, fresco, altar wall, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
19. Filippino Lippi, view of the vault, c. 1488-1493, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
20. Filippino Lippi, The Miracle of Chastity, c. 1488-1493, fresco, west wall, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
21. Filippino Lippi, The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, c. 1488-1493, fresco, west wall, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva.

22. Inscription of papal bull promulgated by Alexander VI, dated 14 June, 1493, west wall, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
23. Filippino Lippi and Raffaellino del Garbo, view of the tomb chamber vault, c. 1494, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
24. Marble balustrade, c. 1488, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
25. Detail of altarpiece frame, c. 1488, marble and gilding, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
26. Pavement, c. 1488, inlaid marble, porphyry and serpentine, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
27. Filippino Lippi, The Cumaean sibyl, c. 1488-1493, fresco, vault, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
28. Anonymous seventeenth-century painter, The Hellespontine sibyl, fresco, vault, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
29. Filippino Lippi, The Tiburtine sibyl, c. 1488-1493, fresco, vault, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
30. Filippino Lippi, The Delphic sibyl, c. 1488-1493, fresco, vault, Carafa chapel, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
31. Filippino Lippi, The Cumaean sibyl, detail of Plate 27.
32. Pollaiuolo brothers, tomb of Sixtus IV, 1484-1496, bronze, Treasury of Saint Peter's, Vatican.
33. Pollaiuolo brothers, Philosophy, 1484-1493, bronze relief, tomb of Sixtus IV, Treasury of Saint Peter's, Vatican.
34. Ariadne sleeping, Roman, 2nd century copy of a Hellenistic original, marble, Gallerie delle Statue, Vatican.
35. Antoniazio Romano, The Annunciate Virgin awarding dowries, c. 1499-1500, panel, chapel of the Annunziata, Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
36. Filippo Lippi, The Annunciation with donors, after 1452, panel, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome.
37. Filippino Lippi, The Archangel Gabriel, detail of Plate 17.
38. Filippino Lippi, The Virgin Annunciate, Saint Thomas Aquinas and Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, detail of Plate 17.
39. Filippino Lippi, Portrait head of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, detail of Plate 38.

40. Filippino Lippi, Barrel vault and Carafa coat of arms, detail of Plate 17.
41. Filippino Lippi, Shelf and other objects, detail of Plate 17.
42. Filippino Lippi, The Virgin of the Assumption with angels, detail of Plate 18.
43. Filippino Lippi, Three angels, detail of Plate 18.
44. Filippino Lippi, The Apostles, detail of The Assumption to the left of the altar, Carafa chapel.
45. Filippino Lippi, The Virgin's tomb and Saint Peter, detail of Plate 44.
46. Filippino Lippi, Landscape, detail of The Assumption to the left of the altar, Carafa chapel.
47. Filippino Lippi, The Apostles, detail of The Assumption to the right of the altar, Carafa chapel.
48. Filippino Lippi, Landscape, detail of The Assumption to the right of the altar, Carafa chapel.
49. Workshop of Perugino, The Assumption of the Virgin, metalpoint, pen and ink, study of the Sistine chapel altarpiece, Vienna, Albertina, 58 404 C.
50. Filippino Lippi, Three musician angels, detail of Plate 18.
51. Filippino Lippi, Head of an apostle, detail of Plate 44.
52. Filippino Lippi, Saint Thomas Aquinas and two angels, detail of Plate 20.
53. Sassetta, The Miracle of the Crucifix, c. 1423-1424, predella panel, Pinacoteca, Vatican.
54. Filippino Lippi, Two men, detail of Plate 20.
55. Bernardo Daddi, The Miracle of Chastity, c. 1338, predella panel, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie, Berlin.
56. Filippino Lippi, Witnesses to the Miracle of Chastity, detail of Plate 20.
57. Filippino Lippi, Saint Thomas Aquinas. Philosophy. Theology. Dialectic and Grammar, detail of Plate 21.
58. Filippino Lippi, Medallion in Aquinas' cathedra, detail of Plate 57.
59. Attributed to Francesco Traini, The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, c. 1340-1345, panel, Santa Caterina, Pisa.

60. Andrea di Bonaiuto, The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, begun 1366, fresco, chapterhouse, priory of Santa Maria Novella, Florence.
61. Andrea di Bonaiuto, The Church militant, begun 1366, fresco, chapterhouse, priory of Santa Maria Novella, Florence.
62. Benozzo Gozzoli, The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, 1470, panel, Louvre, Paris.
63. Filippino Lippi, Study for the Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, pen, ink and wash, London, British Museum, 1860-6-16-75.
64. Filippino Lippi, Early Christian heresiarchs and fifteenth-century witnesses, left hand detail of Plate 21.
65. Filippino Lippi, Early Christian heresiarchs and fifteenth-century witnesses, right hand detail of Plate 21.
66. Filippino Lippi, Portrait head of Friar Joachim Torriani, detail of Plate 65.
67. Medal of Friar Joachim Torriani, obverse, British Museum, London.
68. Medal of Niccolò Orsini, Count of Pitigliano and Nola, obverse, British Museum, London.
69. Filippino Lippi, The Lateran, Rome, and equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, detail of Plate 21.
70. Marten van Heemskerck, View of the Marcus Aurelius at the Lateran, 1532-1535, Roman sketchbook, fol. 71, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin.
71. Filippino Lippi, View of the port of Ripa Grande, Rome, detail of Plate 21.
72. Filippino Lippi, view of the painted framework in the south west corner, Carafa chapel.
73. Filippino Lippi, Man of Sorrows, central detail of west wall frieze, Carafa chapel.
74. Study of details from the antique frieze of a Roman temple at San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Codex Escorialensis, fol. 43^v, Escorial Library.
75. Filippino Lippi, detail of fictive pier flanking The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas, west wall, Carafa chapel.
76. Filippino Lippi, Putto on a sea creature, surviving fragment of dado decoration, west wall, Carafa chapel.
77. Filippino Lippi, detail of central section of a fictive pier flanking The Assumption of the Virgin, altar wall, Carafa chapel.

78. Filippino Lippi, detail of upper section of fictive pier flanking The Assumption of the Virgin, altar wall, Carafa chapel.
79. Raffaellino del Garbo, Carafa coat of arms, stucco and fresco, detail of Plate 23.
80. Raffaellino del Garbo, Angel supporting the Carafa emblem of a book, detail of Plate 23.
81. Raffaellino del Garbo, Ancient rite of animal sacrifice, detail of Plate 23.
82. Raffaellino del Garbo, The death of Virginia, detail of Plate 23.
83. Raffaellino del Garbo, A grotesque, detail of Plate 23.
84. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, the Succorpo looking towards the entrance, 1497-1506, Duomo, Naples.
85. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, side elevation of the Succorpo, looking towards the choir, 1497-1506, Duomo, Naples.
86. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, choir of the Succorpo with the bishop's cathedra, 1497-1506, Duomo, Naples.
87. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, doorway to the sacristy, dated 1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
88. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Matthew and cherubim, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
89. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, side altar, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
90. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, carved pilaster flanking altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
91. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, carved pilaster flanking altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
92. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, upper carved panel in altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
93. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, upper carved panel in altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
94. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, carved panel flanking altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
95. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, carved panel flanking altar niche, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
96. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Portrait statue of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, in present location, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.

97. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, lower panel on entrance gateway, 1497-1506, bronze, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
98. The presbytery, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome, refashioned in the thirteenth century from a fifth-century church.
99. Giovanni di Balduccio, The Arca of Saint Peter Martyr, 1336-1339, Cappella Portinari, Sant'Eustorgio, Milan.
100. Goro di Gregorio The Arca of San Cerbone, 1324, Duomo, Massa Marittima.
101. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Madonna and Christ Child, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
102. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Paul and cherubim, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
103. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Peter, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
104. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Jerome and cherubim, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
105. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Januarius, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
106. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Saint Asprenus, ceiling relief, 1497-1506, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
107. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Portrait head of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, detail of Plate 96.
108. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Portrait statue of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, in previous position before the bishop's cathedra, the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
109. Pace and Giovanni da Firenze, Robert II of Anjou enthroned and on his funerary bier, central section of the tomb of Robert II of Anjou, 1343-1345, Santa Chiara, Naples.
110. Workshop of the Cosmati, bishop's cathedra, 1254, presbytery, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.
111. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Sapientia, carved panel flanking the bishop's cathedra, 1497-1506, choir of the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.
112. Tommaso Malvito and assistants, Prudentia, carved panel flanking the bishop's cathedra, 1497-1506, choir of the Succorpo, Duomo, Naples.

113. Luca della Robbia, Prudence, 1461-1462, glazed terracotta roundel, vault, chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, San Miniato al Monte, Florence.
114. Bramante and assistants, view of the north-east corner of the cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
115. Bramante and assistants, south elevation of cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
116. Bramante and assistants, upper storey of south elevation and detail of frieze showing Carafa's name, c. 1500-1504, the cloister of Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
117. Windows on exterior west wall, mid-fifteenth century, convent of Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
118. Exterior window, detail of Plate 117.
119. Bramante and assistants, dedication inscription, dated 1503, inner wall of south cloister walkway, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
120. Bramante and assistants, view from entrance along north cloister walkway, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
121. Bramante and assistants, doorway on east cloister walkway, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
122. Bramante and assistants, detail of south elevation, cloister, 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
123. Bramante and assistants, composite pier and two Corinthian columns on upper storey of cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
124. Bramante and assistants, pier and Ionic pilaster, lower storey of cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
125. Bramante and assistants, base of Ionic pilaster, detail of Plate 124.
126. Bramante and assistants, profile of base of Ionic pilaster, detail of Plate 124.
127. Bramante and assistants, windows on exterior east wall, c. 1500-1503, convent of Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
128. Bramante and assistants, entrance doorway to convent, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
129. Lateral entrance doorway, c. 1460-1465, San Marco, Rome.
130. Bramante and assistants, upper lunette, detail of Plate 128.

131. Bramante and assistants, The stadera, detail of Plate 128.
132. Bramante and assistants, The open book, detail of Plate 128.
133. Bramante and assistants, window bay on north cloister walkway, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
134. Bramante and assistants, doorway on east cloister walkway, c. 1500-1503, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
135. Bramante and assistants, staircase to upper storey of cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
136. Bramante and assistants, groin vault with Carafa coat of arms, corner of cloister walkway, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
137. Bramante and assistants, corner pier showing Ionic 'thread' pilaster, c. 1500-1504, cloister, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
138. Bramante and assistants, Ionic 'thread' pilaster and 'capitals' of Tuscan pilasters on either side, detail of Plate 137.
139. Bramante and assistants, view of upper storey showing the distortion of the corbels where they meet in the corner, the cloister, c. 1500-1504, Santa Maria della Pace, Rome.
140. Dominican saint kneeling before Saint Sixtus, woodcut from Juan de Torquemada, Meditationes (1467), meditatio xxix, fol. 52^r, British Museum, London.
141. Column and Corinthian capital, c. 1478-1480, walled in at a later date, the cloister of the Cisterna, priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.
142. Coat of arms of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, after 1503, relief on south narthex wall, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.
143. Coat of arms of Pope Julius II, after 1503, relief on south narthex wall, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.
144. Coat of arms of the House of Aragon, after 1503, relief on south narthex wall, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.
145. Workshop of the Cosmati, gospel ambo, first half of the thirteenth century, south aisle, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.
146. South east tower of the Palazzo Venezia, formerly Palazzo di San Marco, 1455-1471, Rome.
147. The vigna of Cardinal Bessarion, mid-fifteenth century, Rome.

148. Attributed to Jacopo della Pila, tomb of Antonio 'Malizia' Carafa, c. 1470 utilising a fourteenth-century sarcophagus, second north aisle chapel, San Domenico Maggiore, Naples.
149. Attributed to Tommaso Malvito, tomb of Francesco Carafa, after 1496, Cappellone del Crocifisso, San Domenico Maggiore, Naples.
150. Attributed to Jacopo della Pila and Tommaso Malvito, tomb of Diomede Carafa, dated 1470 but completed after 1496 (?), Cappellone del Crocifisso, San Domenico Maggiore, Naples.
151. Attributed to Tommaso Malvito, effigy of Francesco Carafa, detail of Plate 149.
152. Attributed to Tommaso del Malvito, The Annunciation, lunette relief on the tomb of Diomede Carafa, detail of Plate 150.
153. Pietro Perugino and assistants, The Assumption of the Virgin with Saint Januarius and Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, c. 1508-1509, panel, south transept chapel, Duomo, Naples.
154. Pietro Perugino and assistants, The Apostles with Saint Paul, Saint Januarius and Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, detail of Plate 153.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Renaissance patronage: Cardinal Carafa in the context of recent debates

This thesis grew originally out of curiosity about the art patronage of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa whose name is to be found inscribed on the entrance arch to the chapel at the end of the south transept of the Roman church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and on the frieze in Bramante's celebrated cloister beside the church of Santa Maria della Pace in Rome.¹ Oliviero Carafa's biography and research into his correspondence reveal, however, that his patronage had a broader base than art patronage, and that his priorities did not necessarily elevate the origination of works of art and architecture above his other patronal commitments. Thus my attention was drawn to wider questions about Renaissance patronage in general.

Two recent symposia on Renaissance patronage, both of which have been followed by publication of their proceedings,² highlight most effectively the consensus on the centrality of patronage as a social and cultural system within Renaissance Europe. Yet within this consensus there are also differences of opinion.³ Debate ranges, for example, around such topics as: whether or not it is productive to distinguish clearly between different types of patronage; what are the origins of Renaissance patronage; what has been the impact of modern historiography on our perception of Renaissance patronage. Without, in the present

context, attempting an overall survey of the literature engendered by such debate, it is appropriate to identify those aspects of current scholarly discussion which contribute to an understanding of the nature and significance of Oliviero Carafa's activities as a patron.

Concern has quite properly been expressed about the uncritical over-use of the term 'patronage'. John Hale, for example, warns that: 'axiomatic as the notion that Renaissance culture flourished in an atmosphere of patronage is, it remains a vague one'.⁴ Gary Ianziti's point that Italian distinguishes clearly between mecenatismo (patronage of the arts) and clientelismo (political patronage) offers one way of introducing a greater degree of rigour when pursuing this elusive concept of patronage. Yet as Ianziti and several other contributors to the Melbourne conference had to concede, these terms must remain fluid.⁵ In a similar fashion, it is crucial to distinguish clearly between, on the one hand, Carafa's political and social activities as a person situated within a web of patron and client relations, and, on the other, his activities as a sponsor of art and scholarship. At the same time, however, it is possible to demonstrate that these two spheres of activity were not divorced from one another, and that the rhythms and dynamism of one sort of patronage depend in many respects on the evolution of the other. Thus whilst we should seek to avoid the conflation of the two kinds of patronage in which Carafa was undoubtedly involved, the very ambiguity of the English word 'patronage' in fact reflects a historical reality.

Political patronage and clientage in Renaissance Italy has recently received a great deal of attention from historians whose research has been informed by the work of social anthropologists of Mediterranean societies. One of them, Ronald Weissman, provides a useful definition of what are generally agreed to be the salient characteristics of such patronage: it is an unequal and complex relationship in which the patron provides his client with far more than mere protection, over a long period of time, and on 'a moral and social rather than a legal basis'.⁶ Historians of Florence have endorsed Weissman's contention that informal social bonds of this kind are just as crucial for our understanding of the mechanisms and processes of Renaissance society as its formal corporate order.⁷ Dale Kent, in particular, has explored the intricacy and dynamic quality of the bonds of 'neighbourhood, friendship and kinship' that existed within Florentine society. Her detailed portrait of the mechanisms, forms of exchange and language of political patronage and clientage in Medicean Florence⁸ leaves no doubt about the crucial role of patronage within Renaissance politics. Cardinal Oliviero Carafa as a highly placed ecclesiastic played a leading role within such political and social networks. He also operated within a variety of patronal spheres, Neapolitan, Roman, Florentine, pan-Italic, clerical and lay. Thus a study of his political patronage and clientage provides an opportunity to test out some of the debates engendered by recent study of Florentine patronage and evaluate its applicability to Italian Renaissance patronage in general.

In the present context, three specific examples will serve to illustrate Carafa's potential in this respect. First, regarding the differences

of opinion as to how deep into the social structure ties of patronage and clientage penetrated,⁹ Carafa, by virtue of his position as a cardinal and prince of the Church, remained one of an élite. He might arguably be seen, on occasions, as a client of popes and princes, but his brokerage never penetrated very deep into the social fabric. At most it might represent the interests of a humble Dominican friar and only then at the behest of the friar's prior and the order's Procurator General.

Second, the theories that have proliferated around the concept of vicinanza in Florentine patronage¹⁰ have far greater pertinence to a city state like Florence than to Italy as a whole. Carafa, by dint of being first a resident and citizen of Naples, and then a cardinal in Rome, negotiated a rather different set of political and social relations from those of his Florentine contemporaries. Nevertheless, by studying such factors as Carafa's relations with and patronage of his extended family; the social and political organisation of the family's residential district in Naples and Carafa's imprint upon the physical fabric of that district,¹¹ it is possible to demonstrate that Carafa, too, had a well-developed sense of his loyalties and obligations towards both parenti and the city vicinanza with which his family had long been associated.

Third, dealing with a patron who was male and celibate (and who, somewhat unusually for the times, apparently adhered to his vow of chastity), means that this study will only deal peripherally with other types of patronage networks such as marriage, godparenthood and women

'as users, facilitators and dispensors of political and social patronage'.¹² There was, however, one other powerful variety of patronage-clientage network in which Carafa participated and one which carried some of the benefits in terms of wealth and property that would normally accrue from advantageous marriage alliances. As a member of the Sacred College of Cardinals, Carafa was extremely well placed to secure, on behalf of his relatives, friends and clients, ecclesiastical offices and benefices. As such he was situated within the nexus of a classic patron-client relationship and one intimately linked to the special nature of Renaissance cardinals' patronage.

David Chambers' article on the difficulties experienced by cardinals in obtaining the necessary finances to enjoy the magnificent life style that, as princes of the Church, they were expected to uphold, remains one of the seminal texts on the Renaissance cardinalate. Other historians have built upon Chambers' work on cardinals' income by studying such matters as papal financial policy, the financial records of the College and the income and expenditure of individual cardinals.¹³ Denys Hay has mapped out the essential characteristics of Renaissance cardinals: their social composition; political status; promotion of clients and relatives; residential accommodation and organisation of their households; patronage of art and scholarship.¹⁴ Attention has also been focused on sixteenth-century cardinals and how they compare in social composition, wealth and life-style to their fifteenth-century counterparts.¹⁵ Linked to these more general studies are a number of case studies of the experience of individual cardinals. Thus Chambers himself has contributed further to our understanding of the political

and social climate in which Renaissance cardinals found themselves by studying both the problems that Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga had in obtaining residential accommodation, and Cardinal Christopher Bainbridge's political career at the papal court.¹⁶ Other monographic studies include those of Pio Paschini on Cardinal Domenico Grimani, Richard Douglas on Cardinal Jacopo Sadoletto, and Kate Lowe on Cardinal Francesco Soderini.¹⁷

Cardinal Oliviero Carafa also presents an apt subject for monographic study. His longevity, papability and pre-eminence at the papal court meant that he took an active part in diplomatic and ecclesiastical affairs for some four decades. As nominal head of the Carafa clan, cardinal representative of the kingdom of Naples and of several religious orders, he was in a position to dispense numerous political and financial favours. He also presents a curious paradox within the Renaissance cardinaliture. On the one hand, like most of his fellow cardinals, he was clearly a pluralist and nepotist. On the other, he had a reputation for moral integrity and a sincere interest in church reform. As such, he anticipates certain of the more ascetically minded cardinals of the Counter-Reformation era described by Barbara McClung Hallman.¹⁸

Thus an essential dimension of this study of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa is a re-evaluation of the ethical dimension of the kinds of patronage in which Renaissance cardinals continuously found themselves involved. Weissman has rightly drawn attention to the moral code of Renaissance patronage, summed up by such social values as fraternal love, respect

and loyalty between patron and client, and a deferential sense of subordination. The partiality implicit in such a relationship did not, in Weissman's view, serve as society's openly sanctioned political morality, but operated, rather, as an unofficial set of assumptions and expectations.¹⁹ That Cardinal Carafa participated in such a moral climate is clear from examination of the letters of recommendation (which were, of course, the principal medium of exchange between Renaissance patron and client), that he both penned and received. Their contents highlight very effectively that sense of reciprocity which a number of historians of Renaissance patronage have asserted to have been one of its fundamental characteristics. The system worked best, when, to use a Plutarchian analogy²⁰ (and one frequently cited in the Renaissance), it proceeded like a well directed ball game.

The study of Oliviero Carafa also sheds light on the origins of Renaissance patronage, a question also debated in recent literature. As pointed out by Weissman, Italian Renaissance patronage represented in certain respects a continuation of feudal behaviour. Nevertheless, as he also argues, patronage was endemic in Mediterranean cities well before the rise of feudalism.²¹ His description of the political and cultural system of patronage used by republican Rome to control and colonize the Mediterranean, together with the analogies that he draws between it and Renaissance patronage, are very telling. Roman senators assumed positions which made them well placed to protect the interests of subject cities and provinces. Foreign cities actively sought, in turn, to acquire such patrons. The patron entertained envoys, introduced them to powerful friends, acted as sponsor and argued their

cases for them. Weissman concludes: 'in sum, in Antiquity and the Renaissance, patronage should be understood broadly as a system of values and behaviour, which emphasises the necessity of having friends in high places in a world in which all politics were personalized'.²²

It is significant, therefore, given Weissman's description of Roman senators' patronage, that the Sacred College of Cardinals was commonly referred to as the Senate. Furthermore, Carafa, as cardinal representative of the kingdom of Naples, performed duties on behalf of that kingdom which were remarkably similar to those enacted on behalf of subject cities and nations by the Roman senators. Carafa's situation in this respect was very similar to Eric Wolf's description of patronage in Mexico where the patrons: 'are those persons who stand guard over the critical synapses which connect the local system to the larger whole'.²³ As will become increasingly obvious, this description is most apt for Carafa whose position within the Curia, and the special duties assigned to him there, made him just the kind of person who could best represent local and specific interests within a wider social and political arena.

Turning specifically to Carafa's patronage of art, this theme provides an opportunity to contribute to recent debate on viable means of co-operation between patrons and artists. Clearly Carafa as a patron enjoyed certain forms of control over the artists in his employ. Yet, given the scepticism that has lately been voiced about the extent to which the patron or a hypothetical 'learned advisor' could impose his or her ideas upon a Renaissance artist's process of visualization,²⁴ it seemed advisable to proceed with caution when defining the kinds of

intervention that Carafa made in the artistic ventures associated with his name. In this respect, this study concurs with the work of those art historians who have highlighted the fact that Renaissance patrons were often dealing with artists who possessed an increasing sense of their own 'artistic licence'.²⁵

Bearing these considerations in mind, Patricia Simons' study on the Tornabuoni chapel in Santa Maria Novella, Florence,²⁶ provides a useful methodological precedent for the examination and assessment of Carafa's major artistic projects. In it, she demonstrates how Giovanni Tornabuoni, the 'patron' in the traditional art-historical sense, acted as a 'middle-man' mediating between numerous kinsmen, friars of the Dominican priory and the Ghirlandaio brothers. Simons thus effectively breaks down the series of binary oppositions - artist v. patron, artistic licence v. advisor and programme - that have tended to polarize the participants in this particular debate. By seeing the chapel scheme as the outcome of a process rather than a system, she builds up a more coherent and fluid picture of Renaissance art patronage. Similarly, when examining Carafa's artistic patronage, it is necessary both to pay due attention to the co-operation and exchange of ideas between Carafa, other interested parties, and his artists, and to acknowledge exactly where each person's particular area of expertise and intervention lay.

One recent historian of Milan has remarked upon the occurrence of 'florentinitas' in Renaissance scholarship, to the neglect of other Italian cities.²⁷ While such concentration on Florence is justified by the quality of the art and the quantity of documentary evidence that

survives, his remonstrance provides a timely encouragement to those scholars who wish to investigate patronage in other urban centres.^{2a} In this respect Carafa and his patronage are potentially interesting topics because they encompass two non-Florentine and, indeed, markedly different cities.

Due to the destruction of much valuable archival material during the 1939-1945 war, Naples and her patronal networks have received relatively little recent scholarly attention. Nevertheless, it appears from general historical surveys that powerful noble families like the Carafa had well-established urban bases and also held large rural estates (latifundia). In addition, while it is generally thought that Alfonso of Aragon's succession as King of Naples was only established through large concessions to a powerful and semi-feudal baronage, Ryder's recent study of Alfonso's statesmanship, based on hitherto unnoticed archival material in the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón in Barcelona, suggests that the Aragonese king was able effectively to free the crown from dependance upon feudal modes of finance and military service. He did so by introducing certain institutions from the Iberian peninsula and reviving others which were already in existence, albeit in a very dilapidated state, within his Italian kingdom.^{2a} On the whole Alfonso tended to rely on the administrative expertise of Spaniards, whereas his successor, Ferdinand (henceforth referred to as Ferrante) was more inclined to employ native Neapolitans. The more politically shrewd of the barons thus learnt to give their allegiance to the Aragonese monarchs and to adapt to the new systems of royal patronage and its

attendant procedures.³⁰ As we shall see, the Carafa family was apparently adept at making such a transition.

Those Neapolitan noble families who chose to serve the Aragonese monarchs were also able to share in the expansion and economic boom which the city of Naples enjoyed during the fifteenth century. As the focal point of the royal court, the city was also the recipient of the extensive cultural patronage of Alfonso, Ferrante and Alfonso II.³¹ This study therefore seeks to explore what kinds of royal mecenatismo Carafa and members of his immediate family sought to emulate.

As regards Rome, a city which, from 1467 until his death in 1511, Carafa made his home, the bibliography is an extensive one. Recent studies on the revival of the fifteenth-century papacy and its increased participation in Italian politics³² provide a context in which to situate Carafa's activities as cardinal, diplomat and patron. Mention has already been made of recent work on the papal fiscal and administrative practice and its effects upon the Renaissance cardinaliture. Since Carafa also appeared on certain occasions to have been self-consciously imitating papal patronage of art, this study also provides another dimension to this specialised topic.³³ It was, moreover, precisely in the areas of theological and humanist study, recently identified by such scholars as Paul Kristeller, John O'Malley, John d'Amico and Charles Stinger³⁴ as the most significant features of Renaissance Rome's intellectual and cultural ambience, that Carafa's efforts as a patron of learning were directed.

In general this work provides a necessary corrective to the older studies of Ludwig von Pastor,³⁶ which, although invaluable for many aspects of Roman political life and for the diplomatic and ecclesiastical affairs of the papacy, present an over-simple, polarised cultural dichotomy between 'a true Christian Renaissance' and 'a false pagan Renaissance'. As Stinger argues, in his study of the Renaissance in Rome, there is considerable evidence that humanists, artists, and the patrons who employed them, were, in point of fact, attempting to link Rome's imperial past with that of the present and to find an accomodation between ancient pagan religions and Christianity.³⁶ Moreover, the intellectual concerns and cultural assumptions that bound Rome's humanists and artists together in a common endeavour were rather different from those working in, for example, Florence. As summarised by Stinger, Florentine civic humanism found inspiration in the ideals of the Athenian polis and the Roman republic, whereas the humanists at the papal court were more interested in the imperial achievements of the Greek and Roman empires. In addition, the majority of humanists in Rome were clerics and therefore less antagonistic than their Florentine counterparts to medieval scholasticism.³⁷ Indeed, in fifteenth-century Rome, there was a marked renewal of interest in Thomism - an intellectual tradition preserved and energetically propagated by the Dominican Order, who were powerfully placed within the Vatican to pursue such a campaign.³⁸ Furthermore, as pointed out by O'Malley in his study of Giles of Viterbo (and also reinforced by the work of a number of other scholars), there was a further major intellectual impulse in Renaissance Rome centered around the rediscovery and study of the Greek fathers.³⁹ Just such cultural preoccupations apparently coloured

Carafa's intellectual interests and inspired his patronage of certain kinds of Renaissance humanist and theological study.

The following study of Carafa as a patron begins conventionally enough with a biographical account which treats his major political and social activities in a thematic way in order to establish the nature and extent of his involvement with a number of different kinds of patron-client networks. In addition, it demonstrates how certain of these commitments and preoccupations impinged upon the types of artistic or scholarly ventures to which he offered his support. On a more mundane, but nevertheless crucially significant, level it investigates his wealth, and the sources of that wealth, since such factors offer certain kinds of important insight into the sort of mecenatismo that he was able to practice.

There follows an assessment of the different ways in which Carafa supported theological and humanist study in Rome by skilful exploitation of the clientage system available to him and located within the papal Curia, the Dominican Order, and his own household. Attention is also focused upon the various processes by which he patronised scholarship - collecting a library, sponsoring early printing, establishing an annual literary festival. By his reputation as a patron per se, and his evident interest in certain kinds of scholarly endeavour, he became the dedicatee of innumerable literary works. It is therefore necessary to assess what, if anything, these dedicated works reveal about Carafa's personal intellectual aptitudes and interests.

The study of Carafa's patronage then shifts its focus to his mecenatismo proper, beginning with a detailed examination of the chapel and tomb chamber in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome. In this study of the first of Carafa's chapel foundations, the principal preoccupation is to determine with what kinds of intervention Carafa can plausibly be credited. Special emphasis is given to Carafa's association with, and specially privileged status within, the Dominican Order whose principal Roman church he was embellishing. Similarly, the historical evidence for the Cardinal's very particular wishes as regards the functions of the chapel is highlighted since these provide insight into the nature of the patron's contribution to the chapel's fabric. In this respect, certain differences of view emerge between this study and the recently published monograph on the chapel by Gail Geiger. While recognising the value of her material, particularly as regards its emphasis on Carafa's commitment to Dominican ideology, I argue that certain aspects of Geiger's thesis remain untenable.

The fourth topic in this study is the second and even grander chapel that Carafa had built and embellished in the crypt of Naples cathedral. Once again the principal perspective governing the examination of the physical fabric of this chapel (known popularly as the Succorpo), and the circumstances of its commission and execution, is the patron's motivation and intentions for the chapel. Much of the discussion therefore focusses on the arguably unique dual function of the Succorpo as both private funerary chapel and a public reliquary chapel, and how these twin functions affected the artists' visualisation of certain key themes of principal concern to their patron.

The remainder of the study then concentrates on a number of other public ecclesiastical monuments sponsored by Carafa, first in his principal place of residence, Rome, and second, in his native city of Naples. In the case of the former city, a reconstruction of Carafa's domestic and private environment is attempted, as well as a discussion of his patronage of Roman churches and conventual buildings. In Naples, a similar kind of separation is discerned between, on the one hand, his private familial acts of artistic patronage, and on the other, his acts of public and civic patronage. While most of these acts of mecenatismo were entirely conventional for a high-ranking Italian ecclesiastic, it is also argued that in some senses, at least, Carafa was behaving in an innovatory way, by self-consciously observing a classically inspired distinction based upon differentiating between public acts of 'magnificence' and private acts of 'splendour'.

Finally, the study concludes with a summary of the main features of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's patronage, and an assessment of the extent to which his case, in certain ways, reinforces some of the assumptions made in recent scholarship, whilst also calling in question other such assumptions and therefore rendering necessary a degree of reassessment concerning both the nature of Renaissance patronage in general and cardinals' patronage in particular.

Notes to Chapter 1

¹The inscription on the entrance arch to the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva is located on a scroll at its apex and reads: 'OLIVERIUS/ CARRAPHA/ CAR. NEAP./ FECIT'. For the inscription dedicating the chapel to the Virgin Annunciate and Saint Thomas Aquinas which ornaments the circumference of the arch, see chapter 4, note 2. The relevant portion of the frieze inscription in the cloister in Santa Maria della Pace reads: 'OLIVERIUS CARRAPHA EPS HOSTIENSIS CARD NEAPOLITAN/ PIE A FUNDAMENTIS EREXIT'. For the full inscription, see chapter 6, note 1.

²Patronage in the Renaissance, G. Fitch Lytle and S. Orgel (eds.), (Princeton, 1981); Patronage, art, and society in the Renaissance, F. W. Kent and P. Simons (eds.), (Oxford, 1986). The bibliography on Renaissance art patronage is a long one and ever expanding. The classic studies remain: J. Burckhardt, Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte von Italien (Basle, 1898); M. Wackernagel, The world of the Florentine Renaissance artist (Leipzig, 1938), trans. A. Luchs (Princeton, 1981); E. H. Gombrich, 'The early Medici as patrons of art', in E. F. Jacob (ed.), Italian Renaissance studies: a tribute to the late Cecilia M. Ady (London, 1960), pp. 279-311. To these may be added a number of more recent publications: D. S. Chambers, Patrons and artists in the Italian Renaissance (London, 1970); M. Baxandall, Painting and experience in fifteenth century Italy (Oxford, 1972), pp. 3-14; O. Logan, Culture and society in Venice 1470-1790 (London, 1972), ch. 8; S. Settis, 'Artisti e committenti fra Quattro e Cinquecento', Storia di Italia. Annali, 4, pp. 791-64; P. Burke, The Italian Renaissance: culture and society in Italy (rev. ed., Oxford, 1980), pp. 88-123.

³F. W. Kent in 'Renaissance patronage: an introductory essay', Patronage, art, and society, p. 11, provides a vivid metaphor of the present state of scholarship: 'we can all, at least, agree that patronage, while now very much on the Renaissance map, still resembles Australia as depicted on early charts: reasonably accurate outlines enclosing large tracts of unexplored and alien territory'. For an assertion of patronage as one of the dominant social processes of pre-industrial Europe, see S. Orgel, 'Preface', pp. xi-xii, and W. L. Gundersheimer, 'Patronage in the Renaissance: an exploratory approach', Patronage in the Renaissance, p. 3.

⁴A concise encyclopedia of the Italian Renaissance, ed. J. R. Hale (London, 1981), p. 239. Gundersheimer, *ibid.*, p. 3, offers a broad definition of patronage as: 'the action of a patron in supporting, encouraging or countenancing a person, institution, work, art etc. '.

⁵G. Ianziti, 'Patronage and the production of history: the case of Quattrocento Milan', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 299-311, esp. p. 300. See also the introductory remarks made in F. W. Kent, 'Renaissance patronage', pp. 2, 19.

⁶R. Weissman, 'Taking patronage seriously: Mediterranean values and Renaissance society', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 25-6.

⁷A. Anzilotti, La crisi costituzionale della Repubblica fiorentina (Florence, 1912), p. 3; G. Brucker, 'The structure of patrician society in Renaissance Florence', Colloquium, I (1964), pp. 8-11; F. W. Kent, Household and lineage in Renaissance Florence: the family life of the Capponi, Ginori and Rucellai (Princeton, 1977); see also his study, in F. W. Kent et. al., Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo Zibaldone. II: a Florentine patrician and his palace (London, 1981), pp. 9-95; A. Molho, 'Cosimo de' Medici: pater patriae or padrino?', Stanford Italian Review, I (1979), pp. 5-33.

⁸D. V. Kent, The rise of the Medici (Oxford, 1978). See also her study, 'The dynamic of Medici power', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 63-77.

⁹For Molho, in 'Cosimo de' Medici', pp. 21, 24, patronage networks did not extend beyond the gonfaloni. For evidence that patronage was operative throughout the social spectrum, see the incident described in F. W. Kent and D. V. Kent, 'Two vignettes of Florentine society in the fifteenth century', Rinascimento, 2nd series, XXIII (1983), pp. 252-60, when, in 1478, a group of plebeian youths rallied to the support of the Medici.

¹⁰While agreeing on the importance of neighbourhood for social relations in Florence and its demonstrable effect on art patronage, modern historical opinion varies as to its social composition and the relationship of neighbourhood politics to the city as a whole. R. Weissman, Ritual brotherhood in Renaissance Florence (New York, 1982), esp. pp. 8-9, 10, 21, 22, sees the multiple communities of parish, gonfalone, and quarters as 'cities in miniature'. R. Trexler, Public life in Renaissance Florence (New York, 1980), p. 14, and passim, identifies only family and civic loyalties. S. K. Cohn, The labouring classes in Renaissance Florence (New York, 1980), passim, sees the issue of neighbourhood organisation as a matter of class, the patriciate enjoying citywide social connections and the popolo minuto, forced to retreat to neighbourhood communities on the periphery of the city. F. W. Kent and D. V. Kent, Neighbours and neighbourhood in Renaissance Florence: the district of the Red Lion in the fifteenth century (New York, 1982), describes an intimate, but hierarchical society of neighbours, friends and relatives which maintained vital links with the central government and other patron-client networks throughout the city.

¹¹Robert Gaston's study of the patronage of San Lorenzo by the residents of the district of the Lion d'oro, in 'Liturgy and patronage in San Lorenzo, Florence, 1350-1650', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 111-134, provides another instance of such familial and neighbourhood-based patronage of a local church. For further discussion of the Carafa family's patronage of their local church of San Domenico Maggiore, Naples, see below, chapter 7, pp. 386-91.

¹²F. W. Kent, 'Renaissance patronage', p. 7. For valuable work in this area of godparenthood, marriage, family lineage, and the role of women in Renaissance society, see C. Klapisch and D. Herlihy, The Tuscans and their families. a study of the Florentine catasto of 1427; C. Klapisch-Zuber, 'Compérage et clientélisme à Florence (1360-1520)',

Ricerche storiche, XV (1985), pp. 61-76; 'Parrains et filleuls: une approche comparée de la France, l'Angleterre et l'Italie médiévales', Medieval Prosopography, VI (1985), pp. 51-77; Women, family and ritual in Renaissance Italy, trans. L. Cochrane (Chicago, 1985).

¹³D. S. Chambers, 'The economic predicament of Renaissance cardinals', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, III (1966), pp. 289-313; P. Partner, 'The "budget" of the Roman Church in the Renaissance period', in Italian Renaissance Studies, pp. 256-278; A. V. Antonovics, 'A late fifteenth-century division register of the College of Cardinals', Papers of the British School at Rome, XXXV (n.s. XXII), (1967), pp. 87-101; P. Partner, 'Papal financial policy in the Renaissance and Counter-Reformation', Past and Present, LXXXVIII (1980), pp. 17-62; B. McLung Hallman, Italian cardinals: reform and the Church as property (1492-1563) (Berkeley, 1985); K.J.P. Lowe, 'Questions of income and expenditure in Renaissance Rome: a case study of Cardinal Francesco Armellini', The Church and wealth, eds. W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (Oxford, 1987), pp. 175-188.

¹⁴D. Hay, 'The Renaissance cardinals: Church, state and culture', Synthesis, III (1976), pp. 35-46, esp. p. 35. See also his The Church in Italy in the fifteenth century (Cambridge, 1977), *passim*; P. Partner, Renaissance Rome, 1500-1559: a portrait of a society (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976), *passim*.

¹⁵A. V. Antonovics, 'Counter-Reformation cardinals, 1534-1590', European Studies Review, II (1972), pp. 301-328; Hallman, Italian cardinals, *passim*.

¹⁶D. S. Chambers, 'The housing problems of Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXIX (1976), pp. 21-58; *ibid.*, Cardinal Bainbridge in the court of Rome, 1509-1514 (Oxford, 1965).

¹⁷P. Paschini, Domenico Grimani, cardinale di San Marco (Rome, 1943); R. M. Douglas, Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547: humanist and reformer (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); K.J.P. Lowe, 'Francesco Soderini (1453-1524), Florentine patrician and cardinal' (PhD. dissertation, University of London, 1985).

¹⁸See above, note 13.

¹⁹Weissman, 'Taking patronage seriously', *passim*.

²⁰Based on Plutarch, Moralia, 582 E-F. See also the useful comments on the 'rhetoric' of Renaissance friendship, in G. Fitch Lytle, 'Friendship and patronage', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 47-61.

²¹Weissman, 'Taking patronage seriously', Patronage, art, and society, pp. 32-3 and *passim*.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 37.

²³E. R. Wolf, 'Aspects of group relations in a complex society, Mexico', American Anthropologist, LVIII (1956), p. 1075, cited in *ibid.*, p. 34.

²⁴C. E. Gilbert, Italian art 1400-1500 (New Jersey, 1980), pp. xviii-xxvii; C. Hope, 'Artists, patrons and advisers in the Italian Renaissance', in Lytle and Orgel, Patronage in the Renaissance, pp. 293-343.

²⁵Hope, *ibid.*, p. 307 and *passim*; H. W. Janson, 'The birth of artistic "license": the dissatisfied patron in the early Renaissance', in Lytle and Orgel, Patronage in the Renaissance, pp. 344-53, esp. p. 353. Cf. M. Kemp, 'From "mimesis" to "fantasia": the quattrocento vocabulary of creation, inspiration and genius in the visual arts', Viator, VIII (1977), pp. 347-98, where the author argues that for patrons and the majority of painters, the 'invention' of subject and its meaning was the prerogative of the patron or qualified humanist adviser.

²⁶P. Simons, 'Patronage in the Tornaquinci chapel, Santa Maria Novella, Florence', in Kent and Simons, Patronage, art, and society, pp. 221-250.

²⁷V. Ilardi, 'The Visconti-Sforza regime of Milan: recently published sources', Renaissance Quarterly, XXXI (1978), pp. 331-43, esp. p. 342. See also A. Quondam, 'Un'assenza, un progetto: per una ricerca sulla storia di Roma tra 1465 e 1527', Studi romani, XXVII (1979), pp. 166-75.

²⁸See, for example, D. Howard, Jacopo Sansovino: architecture and patronage in Renaissance Venice, (New Haven and London, 1975); R. Goffen, Piety and patronage in Renaissance Venice: Bellini, Titian and the Franciscans (New Haven and London, 1986). For patronage in Mantua, see D.S. Chambers *et. al* in the catalogue essays for Splendours of the Gonzagas, eds. D. S. Chambers and J. Martineau (London, 1981), esp. pp. xvii-xxiii, 15-38, 51-64, 73-6. For patronage in other city states, see the essays in Kent and Simons, Patronage, art, and society: I. Robertson, 'Neighbourhood and government in Malatesta Cesena', pp. 99-110; M. Plant, 'Patronage in the circle of the Carrara family, Padua, 1337-1405', pp. 177-200; Ianziti, 'Patronage and production of history: the case of Quattrocento Milan', pp. 299-312.

²⁹A. Ryder, The kingdom of Naples under Alfonso the Magnanimous: the making of a modern state (Oxford, 1976), pp. 367-71 and *passim*.

³⁰See G. Galasso, Dal Comune medievale all'Unità: linee di storia meridionale (Bari, 1969), pp. 73-92, esp. p. 90; G. D'Agostino, La capitale ambigua: Napoli dal 1458 al 1580 (Naples, 1979), pp. 19-90. See also the older but still useful overview given in B. Croce, Storia del Regno di Napoli (4th ed., Bari, 1953), ch. 1, pp. 41-94.

³¹For urban development in Naples during Aragonese rule, see C. de Seta, Napoli (2nd. ed., Rome, 1984), ch. 4, pp. 69-93. The library founded by the House of Aragon was justly famous and has been reconstructed with great care by T. de Marinis, La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona (6 vols., Milan and Verona, 1947-69).

³²For example, P. Partner, The papal state under Martin V: the administration and government of the temporal power in the early fifteenth century (London, 1958); F. Gilbert, The Pope, his banker and Venice (Cambridge, 1980); K. Setton, The papacy and the Levant (1204-1571), (4 vols., Philadelphia, 1976-84).

³³The list of studies on papal patronage is a long one. The most relevant as regards the scope and aspirations of Carafa's mecenatismo are: L. D. Ettlinger, 'Pollaiuolo's tomb of Pope Sixtus IV', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XVI (1953), pp. 239-274; ibid., The Sistine chapel before Michelangelo: religious imagery and papal primacy (Oxford, 1965); S. Sandström, 'The programme for the decoration of the Belvedere of Innocent VIII', Konsthistorisk Tidskrift, XXIX (1960), pp. 35-75; C. William Westfall, In this most perfect paradise: Alberti, Nicholas V. and the invention of conscious urban planning in Rome, 1447-55 (Pennsylvania, 1974); J. Shearman, Raphael's cartoons in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the tapestries for the Sistine chapel (London, 1972); N. R. Parks, 'On the meaning of Pintoricchio's Sala dei Santi', Art History, II (1979), pp. 291-317; B. Sabatine, Pope Nicholas V's chapel of Saints Stephen and Lawrence by Fra Angelico: an historical interpretation (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1984). An older but invaluable study is E. Müntz, Les arts à la cour des Papes pendant le XV^e e le XVI^e siècle (Paris, 1878-82).

³⁴P. O. Kristeller, Le Thomisme e la pensée italienne de la Renaissance (Montreal, 1967); J. O'Malley, Giles of Viterbo on church and reform, a study in Renaissance thought (Leiden, 1968); see also his Praise and blame in Renaissance Rome: rhetoric, doctrine and reform in the sacred orators of the papal court, c. 1450-1521 (Durham, 1979); J. F. d'Amico, Renaissance humanism in papal Rome: humanists and churchmen on the eve of the Reformation (Baltimore, 1983); C. L. Stinger, The Renaissance in Rome (Indiana, 1985).

³⁵L. von Pastor, History of the Popes, ed. and trans. F. I. Antrobus, et. al., (5th ed., London 1949-1950), Vols. IV-VI.

³⁶Stinger, Renaissance Rome, pp. 226-8, 302, 324, and passim.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 334-6. See also D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. xv, 116.

³⁸R. Creytens, 'Le "Studium Romanae Curiae" et le Maître du Sacré Palais', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum (henceforth AFP), XII (1942), pp. 1-83, esp. pp. 69-82; O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 17-20. For further discussion of Dominican ascendancy in the Vatican Palace see below, chapter 2, p. 51, chapter 3, pp. 129, 146-7.

³⁹O'Malley, Giles of Viterbo, pp. 58-9. For a general account of Greek patristic scholarship in Rome, see Stinger, Renaissance in Rome, pp. 228-34.

CHAPTER II

The biography of Oliviero Carafa 1430-1511

The life of Oliviero Carafa has not yet been the subject of a systematic and comprehensive study. There are, however, a number of sources - both published and unpublished - to which the putative biographer can turn. Unfortunately a private family archive now no longer survives either in possession of his direct descendants, the Carafa d'Andria, or the Archivio di Stato in Naples. A number of documents, whose contents pertain to his public and private life, can be found, however, in the Biblioteca Nazionale and Archivio diocesano of Naples. These can be supplemented by a number of references to Carafa in the official curial records of the Vatican Secret Archives and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and the administrative records of the Dominican Order housed in the Archivio Generale at Santa Sabina, Rome. Other vital information about his activities as patron and diplomat is also to be found in the ambassadorial reports of the Archivio di Stato, Florence, and more particularly in the correspondence preserved there in the private archive of the Medici family.

The earliest surviving biographical piece on Oliviero Carafa occurs in Carafa's funeral oration, written by the humanist scholar, Jacopo Sadoletto, and delivered in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, in December 1511, eleven months after the cardinal's death.' It stands as a testament to Carafa's reputation amongst his contemporaries (although couched in the rhetorical style of a Renaissance eulogy) and

provides crucial information on Carafa's origins, education and high office in the kingdom of Naples and the papal Curia. Details of Cardinal Carafa's titles and official duties were also recorded by the official papal historians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.² As a native of Naples, he also figures amongst the biographies of leading Neapolitans, compiled by local seventeenth-century historians.³ These accounts give information on Carafa in terms of his family connections, education, career as an ecclesiastic, and patronage of art and letters. They also provide the basis for modern biographical pieces on Carafa. Scandone's contribution to Pompeo Litta's monumental survey of Italian families owes much to these seventeenth-century writers. He also refers briefly to documents in the family archive of the Carafa d'Andria which no longer survive.⁴ In 1964, Franco Strazzullo wrote an account of the various stages of Carafa's career as a leading ecclesiastic in late fifteenth-century Italy, and summarised his activities as a patron of art and architecture.⁵ Franca Petrucci's entry in the Dizionario biografico degli Italiani (1976) adds other newly discovered biographical detail and also attempts a comprehensive list of manuscripts and early books dedicated to Carafa.⁶ Finally, in his book, Savonarola e la Curia Romana (1969), Romeo de Maio offers a stimulating analysis of Carafa's position in the Curia. Although this modern scholar is largely concerned with the network of official relations between Carafa and the Dominican friar, Savonarola, he nevertheless draws attention to a number of new documents and items of historical information about Carafa as an ecclesiastic and patron of art.⁷

By applying a critical stance towards what has already been published on Oliviero Carafa and supplementing it with new biographical data derived from archival research, it is therefore possible to construct an informed account of the life of Oliviero Carafa. The focus and thematic structure of the account which follows are determined, moreover, by a fundamental consideration which dominates this study as a whole, namely, that Oliviero Carafa's activities as a patron were not confined merely to the patronage of artists and scholars but embraced a much wider network of patron-client relations involving members of his family, certain key religious orders and Italy's ruling dynasties.

Family, education and early career

Oliviero Carafa belonged to a noble Neapolitan family who claimed to have a pedigree stretching back at the very least to the time of the Hohenstaufen rule in southern Italy.² By the fifteenth century, the family had divided into two major branches: the Carafa della Spina and the Carafa della Stadera. Oliviero's immediate family belonged to the latter³ and it is significant that many of the artistic projects later sponsored by him were rendered the more distinctive by the inclusion of the latter's familial device of the steelyard (stadera) as part of their decorative repertoire.

Carafa's grandfather, Antonio 'Malizia' Carafa had supported the Aragonese dynasty in their bid to secure the kingdom of Naples. His sons, Francesco and Diomedes (father and uncle to Oliviero, respectively), therefore entered the service of Alfonso I, the first

Aragonese king of Naples. Both men performed important military, administrative, advisory and diplomatic tasks on behalf of Alfonso and his successor Ferrante.¹⁰ Francesco was appointed as a royal councillor and Diomedes as scrivano di razione in charge of provisioning the army. Diomedes also represented Ferrante on many occasions in diplomatic negotiations.¹¹ As a reward for their loyal service, they both received numerous fiefs and fiscal concessions. Francesco's properties of Torre del Greco, Portici and Resina, formed a compact area of territory just south of Naples.¹² Oliviero Carafa thus belonged to a family who had a history of loyal service to the Aragonese kings of Naples. This was an enormously influential factor in the first stages of his career. Later as he increased in power and political influence, relations between him and the kings of Naples were destined to become more complicated.

Oliviero's mother, Maria Origlia, was an heiress in her own right. Despite a certain discrepancy amongst the Carafa genealogies presented by the family's biographers, it appears that Francesco and Maria had five sons, Carlo, Oliviero, Alessandro, Ettore and Fabrizio, and two daughters (see Table I for the family tree). There may have been other issue from Francesco's second marriage to Violante de'Conti.¹³ The most conclusive evidence for Oliviero having only four brothers occurs in his last will and testament drawn up on 12 March, 1509.¹⁴ Here he designates his heirs as his brothers, Carlo and Ettore, and his nephews, Vincenzo, Archbishop of Naples, Jacopo and Antonio, all sons of his deceased brother, Fabrizio.¹⁴ His brother Alessandro had already died in 1503.

Born on 10 March, 1430, Oliviero Carafa began his career in the Church as a child, when, at the age of seven, he obtained a canonry in the cathedral of Naples¹⁵ and thereby beginning a long association with the cathedral of his home town. As a person destined for high office in the Church, he received a university education in civil and canon law. Sadoletto, in Carafa's funeral oration, states that Carafa had attended the universities of Perugia and Ferrara where he gained praise from scholars and princely rulers alike for his erudition and modest behaviour.¹⁶ The diarist, Jacopo Gherardi, similarly acknowledges Carafa's qualifications in this respect, by designating him: 'iuris canonici et civilis professor'.¹⁷ He may well have received instruction at university from the famous fifteenth-century jurist, Alessandro Tartagna, since in a reported conversation with an auditor of the Rota, Felino Sandei, Carafa was said to have referred to Tartagna as his teacher (praeceptor).¹⁸ Carafa's early training in law was not untypical: as Hay points out, amongst the Italian clergy, 'for every one theologian, there were four graduates in law'.¹⁹ This professional expertise was similarly deemed a worthy attribute for a cardinal and it is therefore significant that Paolo Cortese, in his treatise on the cardinalature (1510), devoted a whole chapter to canon law and how a knowledge of it could be of advantage to the cardinal.²⁰

This combination of powerful family connections and newly-won expertise in law contributed to further ecclesiastical preferment. Shortly after Ferrante's accession to the throne, Carafa was made, on 18 November, 1458, Archbishop of Naples by Pius II. He was consecrated on 29 December, 1458, at Torre del Greco, by the Bishop of Nola with the

Bishops of Acerra and Dragonara in attendance. On 13 January, 1459, he made his official entrance into Naples.²¹ As Archbishop of the extensive and wealthy see of Naples, Carafa enjoyed a measure of political power within the kingdom of Naples. He was called upon to arbitrate in legal transactions which came under the jurisdiction of the archiepiscopal court.²² In addition, Ferrante appointed him vice-protonotary and president of the Sacro Regio Consiglio, which constituted the supreme tribunal in the kingdom.²³ Although the Archbishop of Naples had traditionally enjoyed this office, Sadoletto is quite emphatic that Ferrante specifically wanted to utilise Carafa's skills as a jurist and that he valued his expertise in these matters.²⁴

Ferrante's approval of Carafa receives further confirmation in a number of letters that he wrote in February, 1467, to the College of Cardinals and his ambassador in Rome. In them, he deplores the fact that Naples has no representative in the College and puts forward the name of Oliviero Carafa whom he respects both for his individual abilities and family connections.²⁵ Paul II and the Sacred College apparently recognised the force of these arguments since Carafa's name duly appeared on the list of eight cardinals created in the public consistory of 18 September, 1467.²⁶ On 3 December, he arrived in Rome and received his scarlet hat from Paul II at a public consistory held in the Palazzo di San Marco (the present Palazzo Venezia). He entered the ranks of the cardinal presbyters with the title of SS Pietro e Marcellino.²⁷

Cardinal of Naples

The Sacred College was not at the height of its powers during Carafa's lifetime and the time when its members could claim a share of the papal authority had long passed. The great expansion in their numbers (a process furthered by the creations of Sixtus IV and Alexander VI), weakened their corporate and financial strength, while the establishment of a papal secretariat lessened their administrative function. Nevertheless the College was still the main consultative body of the papal Curia and, as one of its members, Carafa was destined to be one of the pope's chief advisors. As such he was in almost continuous attendance at public and secret consistories held every seven to ten days.²⁸ More important still, for our present purposes, he had the opportunity in secret consistory to 'relate' - propose candidates for ecclesiastical benefices. He was therefore in the position to act time and time again as a patron par excellence promoting the interests of his protégés and clients.

As a relative newcomer and junior member of the Sacred College, Oliviero Carafa did not play a prominent role in curial affairs during the reign of Paul II. He was appointed, however, on 16 November, 1470, together with the Pope's much favoured nephew, Cardinal Marco Barbo, to sit on a commission to investigate the affairs of the Dominican Congregation of Lombardy.²⁹ This marks the first official contact that Carafa had with the Dominicans, a religious order to which, as will be discussed in further detail below, he later offered extensive patronage. On

5 September, 1470, he received further official recognition from Paul II who promoted him to the title of Cardinal Presbyter of Sant'Eusebio.³⁰

As Cardinal of Sant'Eusebio, Carafa participated in the 1471 July/August conclave which elected Francesco della Rovere as pope. One of the most pressing tasks for the new pontiff was the defence of Christendom against the Turks who, under the leadership of Mehmet II, had occupied Negroponte in the previous year. On 23 December, 1471, Sixtus IV in secret consistory appointed five legates to be dispatched to the major Christian powers in order to prosecute a crusade against the infidel. Carafa was appointed legate to Naples.³¹

The Pope's diplomatic efforts were successful to the extent that Venice and Naples agreed to furnish a joint armada to be sent against the Turks. Somewhat suprisingly, given his lack of military experience, Carafa was appointed commander of the papal fleet that Sixtus IV had rapidly equipped.³² The day of departure, 28 May, 1472, and significantly the feast of Corpus Christi, was marked by elaborate ceremonial. Carafa, as papal legate and admiral of the fleet, was given the honour of acting as the celebrant at the papal mass held in Saint Peter's, a ceremony where the Pope also blessed the flags to be carried on the crusade. The papal court then went in solemn procession to the port of the Ripa Grande where the papal galleys were moored. Here the Pope gave his benediction to the fleet from the deck of Carafa's galley and the fleet duly departed towards Ostia.³³

The fleet first sailed to Naples where Carafa was received with great honour by Ferrante and his court.³⁴ Having sailed to Rhodes to join the Venetian and Neapolitan contingents, Carafa took the opportunity to settle a dispute amongst the Knights of Saint John of Jerusalem. The first offensive occurred at the port of Satalia (Adalia) on the coast of Asia Minor. Here the fleet broke the harbour chain and subjected the city to bombardment but left the fortifications practically intact. The fleet then proceeded to Smyrna (Izmir) which on 13 September, 1472, they attacked from land and sea, eventually sacking the city and thereby destroying many of its ancient monuments.³⁵ The Venetians then withdrew to Nauplia for the winter but the papal fleet elected to return to Italy. Carafa's return to Rome on 23 January, 1473, was marked by a triumphal procession numbering amongst its participants camels and Turkish prisoners.³⁶ Portions of the harbour chain from Satalia were hung over the entrance of Saint Peter's together with an inscription commemorating Carafa's exploits on this expedition.³⁷ Despite the fact that the enterprise did little to halt the advance of the Turks, it was evidently deemed as one of the crowning achievements of Sixtus IV's reign and considered worthy of inclusion amongst the late fifteenth-century istorie celebrating the life of that pontiff which line the walls of the Corsia Sistina in the hospital of Santo Spirito, Rome. Here Carafa is shown at the moment of triumph standing on the deck of his ship surveying a group of captive Turks. An inscription remarkably similar in wording to the chain inscription in Saint Peter's once appeared below the painting.³⁸ As revealed in chapter four below, Carafa himself was not adverse to using painted imagery to commemorate this colourful episode in his life.

Carafa's appointment as papal legate acts as a clear indication of one of his principal roles - namely ambassador and protector of the kingdom of Naples' affairs at the papal Curia. It was for this reason that Ferrante argued for Carafa's promotion to the cardinaliture, and for the rest of his life Carafa was always referred to as Cardinal of Naples (Cardinalis Neapolitanus, Cardinale di Napoli). It is not surprising, therefore, that he figured prominently in the official reception given to Ferrante's daughter, Eleanora, who arrived in Rome in June, 1472, on her way to Ferrara where she was to be married to Ercole d'Este, Duke of Ferrara. Eleanora herself gives a vivacious account of this visit in a letter, dated 10 June, to her father. Amidst her descriptions of sumptuous banquets and festivities held in her honour, she mentions how Cardinal Carafa presented her with gifts, accompanied her on a visit to the Pope where she was granted permission to visit the relic of the Volto Santo in Saint Peter's, and on the day of her departure escorted her on a tour around the Roman Forum.³⁹

On 24 July, 1476, Carafa entered the rank of the cardinal bishops with the title of Cardinal Bishop of Albano. He received the appointment outside Rome since he was amongst the ten cardinals who accompanied Sixtus IV to Viterbo in order to escape the plague in Rome.⁴⁰ According to Jacopo Gherardi, the title should have gone to Cardinal Jacopo Ammanati-Piccolomini, since he was made cardinal before Carafa, and Carafa's preferment therefore caused some resentment.⁴¹ Seniority amongst cardinals is not, however, reckoned according to the date of reception into the Sacred College but according to the date of episcopal consecration. Carafa had been Archbishop of Naples since 1458 and

therefore his promotion was quite legitimate. As a further mark of his increasing importance in the papal Curia, he acted as Chamberlain of the Sacred College between January, 1477, and 1478.

In mid-September, 1476, Carafa made a rare visit to his archiepiscopal seat in Naples. On this occasion he had been appointed as papal legate to preside over the marriage-by-proxy and coronation of another of Ferrante's daughters, Beatrice, to Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary. Local chroniclers give lively accounts of the nuptial and coronation mass where Carafa acted as celebrant, and the subsequent festivities which included the distribution of silver coins to the crowds, jousting and the staging of Petrarch's Trionfi by the Florentine community of Naples.⁴²

Several years later, in 1482, Carafa's close association with Naples and its ruler involved him in much less happy circumstances. Sixtus IV had promised to support the Venetians in their attempt to conquer Ferrara. Ferrante, in support of his son-in-law Ercole d'Este, accordingly sent forces under his son, Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, to menace the papal states. In April, 1482, Alfonso was encamped under the walls of Rome and on this occasion Carafa acted as chief negotiator between the two warring parties. The matter was finally resolved by Alfonso's defeat at the hands of the papal condottiere, Roberto Malatesta, on 21 August, 1482, at Campo Morto. Carafa's role as mediator was not however forgotten but received public recognition in the form of an oration which loudly praised his efforts as a peacemaker.⁴³

On 31 January, 1483, Carafa received the prestigious title of Cardinal Bishop of Sabina which gave him the jurisdiction of an extensive area outside Rome approximating the ancient territory of the Sabines.⁴⁴ Carafa was now second in importance in the Sacred College and therefore a potentially powerful candidate in the papal conclave that took place after the death of Sixtus IV on 12 August, 1484. As was characteristic of all fifteenth-century papal elections, the rulers of the principal Italian states took a keen interest in this particular election's outcome and made vigorous representations to the cardinal electors that their favoured candidate be made pope. In this respect Carafa began with an advantage since Ferrante, as the Aragonese ruler of Naples, wanted either Carafa or the Spaniard, Rodrigo Borgia, as pope.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, it appeared from the results of the first scrutiny that Cardinal Marco Barbo would be the successful candidate. In order to prevent the election of a Venetian pope, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere energetically promoted the election of the Genoese cardinal, Giovanni Battista Cibo. This tactic received the influential support of the rulers of both Naples and Milan and with this powerful lobby behind him Cibo was duly elected pope, taking the name of Innocent VIII.⁴⁶ In the final count of the election Carafa had given his vote to Cardinal Cibo but soon found himself embroiled in political conflicts between Ferrante and the newly created pope.

On 20 October, 1484, Alfonso of Calabria arrived in Rome in order to perform, on behalf of his father, the act of homage that, as ruler of a papal fief, the king of Naples was customarily expected to enact before each new pope. He was met by the usual ceremonial delegation of

cardinals at the city gate of Santa Maria del Popolo. The Vice Chancellor, Rodrigo Borgia, and Cardinal Carafa took precedence in the calvacade that escorted the Duke to the Vatican Palace. Carafa again accompanied Alfonso to the gate of San Giovanni Laterano on his departure from Rome on 26 October.⁴⁷ The visit, however, had been marred by the pope's refusal to accede to Alfonso's request, on behalf of his father, that Ferrante be given patronage rights over the churches of Benevento, Terracina and Pontecorvo.

By 1485, diplomatic relations between Ferrante and Innocent VIII had steadily deteriorated. In July of that year, certain of the Neapolitan barons, angered by the arrogant and tactless behaviour of Alfonso, revolted against Ferrante. Innocent VIII, weary of Ferrante's repeated violations of the Church's privileges within the kingdom of Naples, accepted the invitation of the rebel barons to ally himself to their cause. It appears from the contents of a letter written on 29 October, 1485, and addressed to Cardinal Marco Barbo by his close associate, Giovanni Lorenzi, that Carafa also disapproved of Alfonso's tyranny and saw it as the cause of the divisions in the kingdom.⁴⁸ Ironically at a time when Carafa was apparently expressing reservations about the conduct of one of Ferrante's sons, he had just gained by the death of another. On 17 October, 1485, Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon died in Rome. Carafa had evidently enjoyed good relations with the young cardinal who, in September, 1483, had visited Carafa's villa on the Quirinal.⁴⁹ Carafa acted as Cardinal Giovanni's executor and judging by the detailed description of the funeral exequies arranged by the papal

master of ceremonies, Johannes Burchard, in consultation with Cardinal Carafa, he took his responsibilities seriously.⁵⁰

Two days after Cardinal Giovanni's death, Carafa received in the redistribution of his benefices, the south Italian abbeys of Montevergine and Santa Trinita di Cava. Montevergine was of especial interest to Ferrante since, in 1480, during renovation work on the high altar of the church, relics of Saint Januarius (the major patron saint of Naples) had been discovered. Ferrante was anxious to obtain the necessary papal permission for the translation of these relics to Naples and in 1485 wrote to Carafa accordingly. Carafa, however, apparently deemed the poor relations between the pope and king sufficient reason for not pursuing this matter at that particular time. The translation of the saint's relics was therefore not accomplished until some eleven years later, and then entirely at the behest of Cardinal Carafa himself.⁵¹

Meanwhile Carafa continued to act as a principal figure in the tortuous diplomatic negotiations between Innocent VIII and Ferrante. His name duly appeared amongst other signatories on the Pope's ratification of the peace with Naples published on 12 September, 1486.⁵² Subsequently, however, relations between Ferrante and Carafa were cool,⁵³ and somewhat suprisingly, as Cardinal of Naples, the latter did not take an active part in the negotiations led by Pontano, which (after Ferrante's excommunication in 1489), effected yet another accord in January, 1492.⁵⁴

In the conclave that followed the death of Innocent VIII on 26 July, 1492, Carafa could no longer rely on the support of Ferrante to enable him to obtain sufficient votes to attain the papal tiara. His main chance of success therefore lay in his reputation as a man of great moral integrity. At the first scrutiny, Carafa obtained nine votes, two more than the other most powerful candidate, Rodrigo Borgia. At the second scrutiny, the two candidates each obtained eight votes. At the third, Carafa secured ten votes to Borgia's eight. A measure of Carafa's influence at that point of the election can be gauged from Filippo Valori's dispatch of 11 August, to the Otto di Pratica in Florence, where he offered the opinion that Carafa had a good chance of winning. Ultimately Ferrante's opposition to Carafa was to prove the most decisive factor in preventing Carafa becoming pope. Out of a sense of misguided solidarity with Ferrante, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere withdrew his influential support for Carafa's election. Rodrigo Borgia was therefore able to bribe Cardinal Ascanio Sforza and other members of the conclave to a sufficient degree to secure the desired number of votes.⁵⁵

As evidence of his integrity, Carafa was amongst those cardinals who refused any new titles or honours in the customary round of appointments that followed the creation of a new pope. Regardless of his ambivalent feelings towards both Alexander VI and Ferrante, Carafa soon found himself again acting as principal mediator between the Pope and King of Naples. For example, in late February, 1493, he and Cardinal Piccolomini remonstrated with the Pope on behalf of Beatrice of Aragon, whose second husband, Ladislaus, King of Hungary, was trying to

secure an annulment of their marriage. A few months later, he took part in another set of diplomatic negotiations involving the Neapolitan royal family which led to the betrothal of Alexander VI's son, Joffroi Borgia to Ferrante's illegitimate daughter, Sancia.⁵⁶

On 27 January, 1494, the news of Ferrante's death reached Rome and on 14 March, Carafa received his brother, Alessandro (Archbishop of Naples since 1484⁵⁷), as a member of the delegation sent by Alfonso in order to ratify his accession to the throne of Naples.⁵⁸ Largely due to the efforts of both Oliviero and Alessandro Carafa, Alfonso's claims to the crown were given formal recognition in the public consistory of 18 April, 1494. Carafa did not, however, receive the honour of attending the coronation as papal legate. Instead the pope chose a relative of his, Cardinal Juan Borgia, who officiated at the coronation ceremony held in the cathedral of Naples on 8 May, 1494. Archbishop Alessandro Carafa was, however, in attendance.⁵⁹

Carafa's political stance at that time appears to have been one of support for Alexander VI against any attempt by the French king, Charles VIII, to force the pope to recognise the Angevin claim to the throne of Naples. As such he was directly in opposition to Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere who had a pronounced sympathy towards the French cause. When Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, fearing for his safety after the election of Alexander VI, had retired to the safety of the della Rovere fortress at Ostia, Carafa had been appointed together with Cardinal Giorgio Costa to sue with the recalcitrant cardinal. Through Carafa's good offices, a reconciliation was duly effected in July, 1493.

Nevertheless Cardinal della Rovere did not trust the pope and fled a year later to the court of Charles VIII.⁶⁰

In September, 1494, Charles VIII invaded Italy and by December was at the gates of Rome. Despite this impending threat. Alexander VI on Christmas day demonstrated his tacit support of the Aragonese dynasty of Naples by investing Alfonso II's son, Ferdinand, with the title of the Duke of Calabria. As befitting the Cardinal of Naples, Carafa took a prominent part in the ceremony of investiture.⁶¹

During Charles VIII's sojourn in Rome, Carafa initially expressed hostility towards the French king and was one of the few cardinals who refused to pay Charles homage on his entry into the city on 31 December. Similarly when Alexander VI, in a vain attempt of resisting Charles' demands, retired to the Castel Sant'Angelo on 7 January, 1495, Carafa was one of the six cardinals who accompanied him.⁶² He also remained constantly by the pope's side during the ensuing discussions which resulted in an agreement between Alexander and Charles on 15 January. Despite his ostensible loyalty towards the Aragonese regime, Carafa is also reported as having prudently given the French king thirty thousand scudi⁶³ in order to assure the protection of his relatives in Naples - a striking incident of Carafa acting as the head of the clan and preserving his family's interests at the expense of his erstwhile royal patrons.

It appears from the eye-witness account given by Philippe de Comines of Charles VIII's entry into Naples on 22 February that the Carafa family

(possibly following the lead of their powerful relative in Rome) received the king meekly enough:

Et fut receu le Roy à grant joy et solempnité dedans la ville; et tout le monde luy vint au devant, et ceulx qui plus estoient obligez à la maison d'Arragon les premiers, comme tous ceulx de la maison de Caraffe, qui tenoient de ladite maison d'Arragon quarente mil ducatz de revenu.

In particular, Carafa's brother, Alessandro in his official capacity as Archbishop of Naples, was obliged to treat with the French king obtaining from him confirmation of the ecclesiastical privileges that the Neapolitan church had once enjoyed under the Aragonese rulers. He also presided over the religious ceremony attended by Charles VIII on 3 May, 1495, which witnessed the liquefaction of the blood of Saint Januarius.⁶⁴

Despite the apparent co-operation of the Carafa with the French, the family's position did not suffer an eclipse once the House of Aragon reasserted its hold over the kingdom of Naples. Alessandro, as Archbishop of Naples, continued to officiate at major ecclesiastical events attended by the Aragonese monarchs. For example, on 5 October, 1496, he led the procession of Saint Januarius' relics, a procession staged to assist Ferdinand II's recovery from what proved to be a terminal illness. He also officiated at the coronation of Ferdinand's successor, Federigo II.⁶⁵

During this last phase of Aragonese rule in southern Italy, Cardinal Carafa was also able to effect the translation of Saint Januarius' relics from Montevergine to Naples. Although the original rescript of Alexander VI, giving authorisation for this translation, is now lost, several contemporary accounts clearly state that Cardinal Carafa obtained such a brief. On January 13, 1497, Alessandro Carafa brought the relics into the city of Naples and placed them in the Duomo of Naples. In order to display these relics in a worthy setting, Carafa financed the building of a chapel - known popularly as the Succorpo - in the crypt of the Duomo. This chapel which, according to one contemporary chronicler, was begun in 1497 and completed in 1508, will be the subject of chapter five. At this juncture it should be noted, however, that the prestige of acquiring these relics resounded entirely on Carafa and members of his immediate family and not on the House of Aragon.⁶⁶

Meanwhile, in Rome, Carafa had been given the task of mediating between the Orsini and Alexander VI. Due to his efforts an agreement was reached on 5 February, 1497.⁶⁷ A year later his abilities as a diplomat were again called into play, this time on a papal legation to his home town of Naples. This event was marked by the customary ceremonial that attended upon the arrivals and departures of Renaissance potentates. Burchard gives a graphic description of the cardinal legate's departure on 19 April, 1498. Two galleys were sent to convey him to Naples and he was accompanied to the embarkation point by other cardinals, prelates and ambassadors. Neapolitan chroniclers also describe his arrival in Naples, disembarking at the Castel del'Ovo to be met by King Federico

and given a splendid escort to the Archbishop's palace.⁶⁸ His relations with the Aragonese royal family were again on a good footing after the diplomatic difficulties experienced by Carafa during Ferrante's last years. Doubtless it was during this sojourn in Naples that Carafa initiated the first phase of work on the Succorpo in the city's cathedral.

On his return to Rome on 29 January, 1499, he was accorded the customary honour of a delegation of highly-placed ecclesiastics awaiting his arrival at the city gate of San Paolo fuori le Mura. Back in Rome, he again took an active part in curial business and participated in numerous official ceremonies. Thus on 11 November, 1499, he officiated at the baptism of Lucrezia Borgia's son, Rodrigo, and on 8 February, 1501, acted as one of the three cardinal trustees of the decima. This tax, so called because it exacted a tenth of the cardinals' annual income, was levied in order to meet the expenses for the preparation of a crusade against the Turks.⁶⁹

At the death of Alexander VI, on 31 July, 1503, Carafa had another chance to obtain the papal tiara.⁷⁰ The initial stages of the election were marked by a confrontation between Cesare Borgia and thirteen cardinal adherents versus the remainder of the College headed by Carafa as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina. On 5 September, the College was reunited as an electoral body. The first conclave was held in the Vatican and subsequent conclaves in the priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. These resulted in the election of the short lived Pius III. From the dispatches of Antonio Giustiniani, it appears that, at least in the case

of the Venetian ambassador, it was confidently expected that Oliviero Carafa would ascend the pontifical throne. In his dispatch of 23 September, 1503, Giustiniani had to admit, however, that the powerful Spanish lobby had blocked Carafa's chances of election because he was deemed too sympathetic towards the French.⁷¹ Some forty letters exchanged between Ferdinand of Spain and Carafa survive, whose contents, dealing with monastic reform, election of bishops in Spanish dioceses and the supervision of the Inquisition, suggest that relations between the King of Spain and the Cardinal of Naples were good.⁷² Nevertheless, it was Carafa's misfortune that, at the crucial time of the papal election, the current rulers of southern Italy yet again chose not to support the election of a Neapolitan to the throne of Saint Peter.

In the October conclave that followed the death of Pius III, Carafa gave his vote to Giuliano della Rovere who took the name of Julius II. As a reward for his support he received the title of Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and thus achieved the most senior position with the Sacred College. Under the new pope, Carafa, who by that time was over seventy years of age, participated less actively in the politics of the day. On 26 August, 1506, for example, when Julius II left Rome to take a personal part in the military campaign against the Bentivoglio in Bologna, Carafa was not expected to follow the pope. He remained instead in Rome as papal Vicar.⁷³

In June, 1509, the Venetian Republic, after their disastrous defeat at Agnadello, sent their ambassadors to Rome to treat for peace with Julius II. They were received in Carafa's palace since he, together with

Cardinal Raffaello Riario, had been appointed to initiate peace negotiations between the papacy and Venice. In February, 1510, Carafa was present at the signing of the peace treaty drawn up as a result of these negotiations.⁷⁴ He was again exempt from the military expedition undertaken by Julius II against the Bentivoglio in 1510.

Carafa's official prestige in the later stages of his career is amply attested by Antonio Giustiniani's dispatches penned between 1502 and 1505. In them, Giustiniani regularly refers to the Cardinal of Naples as a person who holds the ear of the pope and whose opinion and support is worth cultivating. Indeed, on a number of occasions Giustiniani offers the opinion that Cardinal Carafa acts as a much needed curb on Julius II belligerent and nepotistic temperament.⁷⁵ Thus while Carafa narrowly failed to achieve the ultimate goal of the throne of Saint Peter, he had attained, by the end of his life, an undeniable position of great power and respect within the Sacred College and the papal Curia.

Relations with the Medici

Cardinal Carafa's pre-eminent position at the Curia is also evident from the close diplomatic and personal relations that he had, first with Lorenzo de' Medici, and then with Lorenzo's son Piero, in their capacity as de facto head of the Florentine government. A revealing picture of the nature of their relationship can be built up from the contents of a series of twenty one letters, mostly unpublished, in the Medici family archive in the Archivio di Stato, Florence. (See Appendix I for these

letters, their dates and archival references.) Of these, eighteen were written by Carafa himself; ten to Lorenzo il Magnifico, seven to Piero (the first, a letter of condolence on the death of Lorenzo in 1492) and one to Gabriele, Abbot of Monte Scalario. The remaining four letters are copies of letters sent to Carafa, two composed by Lorenzo (one of which is in rough draft as well as in a clean copy) and one written by Dionigi Pucci on behalf of Piero de' Medici.

The dates of the letters range from November 30, 1471, to February 3, 1495 (1494, old style). The letters therefore encompass a range of Carafa's titles, beginning with Cardinal Presbyter of Sant'Eusebio, followed by Cardinal Bishop of Albano and ending with Cardinal Bishop of Sabina. The majority of the letters from Carafa were sent from Rome. The exceptions are two letters written in 1476, one, on August 9, from Narni, and the other, on November 19, from Naples, at the time when Carafa had been appointed papal legate for the marriage and coronation of Beatrice of Aragon to Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary. The letters sent to Carafa were all written in Florence.

The contents of these letters reveal Carafa as a classic example of a Renaissance patron, dispensing and requesting favours on his clients' behalf.⁷⁶ The first letter (dated November 30, 1471, and the only one written in Latin, the rest being in Italian) characteristically requests that Lorenzo de' Medici obtain a position in the Arte della Lana for Carafa's protégé, Giovanni Pietro. A few months later, on April 12, Carafa reminds Lorenzo that, when Lorenzo was in Rome, he had promised to obtain this guild office for Giovanni Pietro di Tommaso da Spoleto.

Lorenzo had apparently neglected to keep this promise, or answer any of Carafa's letters referring to this matter, and therefore he was writing to urge Lorenzo to fulfil this promise. In a similar vein, in a letter of February 4, 1473, Carafa remonstrates with Lorenzo for not acting upon his recommendation that Messer Lorenzo Justino be appointed prefect of Foligno and firmly requests that his client be elected to the post.

The letter written on August 9, 1476, provides evidence for Carafa's power of intervention as regards the appointment of the podestà of Florence. In it, he states his wish that, through Lorenzo's intercession, Messer Battista Geraldino be elected podestà of Florence. He acknowledges the influence that Lorenzo could bring to bear on this matter and points out that the Florentine Republic would be well served by this expert in Italian affairs. Sixteen years later, Carafa wrote to Piero de'Medici on a similar matter. In a letter dated July 20, 1492, Carafa declares that he had examined Messer Roberto, doctor of law and councillor of the lord of Rimini, and found him to be 'una persona ornatissima de virtù'.⁷⁷ He therefore requests Piero to obtain from the Signoria the appointment of Messer Roberto to the post of podestà. A few months later, on September 22, Carafa wrote again, requesting on this occasion that Messer Antonio d'Albizzi be made podestà of Florence since he was not only a knight and doctor of law, but also the current podestà of Bologna - a recommendation in itself.

For centuries the office of podestà (the city's chief magistrate and head of the judiciary) had always been given to a noble with some legal training who was not a native Florentine. His term of office was

formally fixed for one year, although in exceptional circumstances his tenure could be extended. The fact that Carafa had the power of recommendation is a measure of the influence that he had over the nominal head of Florence's government (whether his advice was acted upon or not). It also acts as an indication of an acknowledged expertise in the affairs of the Italian peninsula as a whole.

Related to this group of letters treating of the appointment of podestà, are two more which refer to the appointment of Messer Jacopo del Conte to an unspecified post in Florence. The first, written to Piero, on August 25, 1493, states that Messer Jacopo's term of office was coming to an end and, since he had served the Signoria well, Carafa wished to secure his re-appointment. From a second letter, written on February 3, 1495, it appears that Carafa's request had not been acted upon, since Carafa was now writing on his client's behalf to obtain the salary entitled to him after the termination of his period of office.

Several of these letters furnish introductions of named individuals to the Medici. In a letter from Naples, dated November 19, 1476, Carafa introduces his adopted 'father', the Count of Maddaloni, with the preamble that there was little necessity for such an introduction but that he was merely complying with the Neapolitan ambassador's wishes. The letter therefore acts as an indication of the affectionate regard that Carafa had for his uncle, Diomede Carafa, Count of Maddaloni. It also records an instance of Diomede acting as official spokesman on behalf of the King of Naples on matters of foreign diplomacy.⁷⁸

On March 26, 1488, Carafa supplied another letter of introduction on behalf of Maso di Martinelli, on grounds of his unspecified capabilities. He also used Maso as an agent for repaying a sum of money that he owed Lorenzo. Yet other letters deal with the affairs of Florence's subject cities. For example, on June 5, 1489, Carafa requested Lorenzo to intervene on behalf of Donato da Cesena, whose nephew had been killed while in the custody of the governor of Cortona. In another letter, dated January 1, 1491, Carafa asks Lorenzo to honour a papal bull granting the office of coadjutor in Arezzo to an auditor of the papal Camera, Antonio de'Grassis.

Two letters, dated respectively April 6, 1488, and September 14, 1493, refer to the affairs of the Vallombrosan Order, and more specifically to Carafa using the Order's Procurator General, Gabriele Mazzinghi, as his agent in these matters. These letters thus provide evidence of Carafa acting in his capacity as Cardinal Protector of the Vallombrosan Order, and a discussion of their contents will occur therefore at a later stage in this chapter. (Similarly the content of a letter dated July 5, 1493, to Piero de'Medici on the subject of the Dominican priory of San Marco will be scrutinised in conjunction with the account of Carafa's relations with the Dominican Order as set out below.)

The content of the letter written by Carafa on September 2, 1488, to Gabriele Mazzinghi, Abbot of Monte Scalaro and Procurator General of the Vallombrosan Order, deserves analysis at this point, however, since it has much to reveal about Carafa's political relations with Lorenzo de'Medici at the time of writing it. In it, Carafa describes in

enthusiastic terms his projected scheme for a chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva - the principal Dominican church in Rome.⁷⁹ This chapel and its scheme of decoration will be the subject of chapter four. Carafa also states that he is greatly indebted to Lorenzo de' Medici for sending the painter, Filippino Lippi, to Rome, with his influential recommendation to work on the project. This act of patronage is all the more extraordinary since, on 21 April 1487, Filippino Lippi had been commissioned by Filippo Strozzi to fresco a large chapel in the Dominican church of Santa Maria Novella in Florence.⁸⁰ Indeed on 2 May, 1489, Filippino Lippi was obliged to write to his Florentine patron, offering his excuses for not returning to Florence to complete his work on Strozzi's family chapel in Santa Maria Novella.⁸¹

Circumstantial evidence suggests that Filippo Strozzi was obliged to give Filippino Lippi permission to postpone work on the Strozzi chapel. As a one-time political exile, Filippo Strozzi was dependent on Lorenzo de' Medici's favour. No doubt the Dominican prior of Santa Maria Novella was also anxious to co-operate on an artistic venture initiated by Cardinal Carafa who, as will be discussed in greater detail below, had an enormous influence over the Dominican Order at that time. Filippo Strozzi himself had contacts with the Carafa family. He had been resident in Naples during the years of his exile and, once recalled to Florence, maintained his banking interests within the kingdom.⁸² In October, 1486, the Roman branch of his banking firm paid 300 ducats to Cardinal Carafa.⁸³ It is not surprising therefore that Filippo Strozzi was not averse to facilitating the completion of Carafa's scheme before his own.

What was Lorenzo de'Medici's interest in promoting the affairs of Cardinal Carafa? In 1488, Lorenzo was in the throes of an energetic campaign to acquire a cardinal's hat for his youngest son, Giovanni. Since Giovanni's admission into minor orders at the age of eight, Lorenzo had promoted his son's ecclesiastical preferment untiringly, pulling every diplomatic string to obtain wealthy benefices for him. These included the French abbey of Fonte Dolce, and the Italian abbeys of Passignano and Monte Cassino. Lorenzo's seizure of the Vallombrosan abbey of San Michele at Passignano had met with some resistance from Carafa, in his capacity as Cardinal Protector of the Vallombrosan Order.⁸⁴ Carafa was also opposed to Giovanni's nomination as cardinal, on the grounds of the boy's tender years, and had to be persuaded therefore of the merits of the case. This much is clear from the letters sent to Lorenzo by Giovanni Lanfredini, the Florentine representative in Rome, on 21 June, 1 December, 1488, and 7, 8, 9, February, 1489.⁸⁵ Accordingly, on 14 February, 1489, Lorenzo sent a series of letters, requesting a cardinal's hat for Giovanni, to seven high-ranking cardinals (Giuliano della Rovere, Cardinal of San Pietro in Vincoli; Giorgio Costa, Cardinal of Lisbon; Cardinal Giovanni Battista Orsini; Marco Barbo, Cardinal of San Marco; Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, the Vice Chancellor; and Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal of Naples).⁸⁶ Lorenzo's final request was not in vain since, on 9 March, 1489, Giovanni de'Medici was duly elected cardinal with the proviso that he could not take his seat in the College for three years.⁸⁷

It is therefore legitimate to infer that Lorenzo sending Filippino Lippi to Rome in September, 1488, in order that he might work on the Cardinal

of Naples' newly inaugurated chapel, was part of Lorenzo's campaign to win Oliviero Carafa over to his son's elevation to the cardinaliture.⁸⁸ The particular circumstances behind Carafa's Roman chapel commission act as one of the most vivid instances of the way in which political considerations affected the initiation and progress of many Renaissance artistic projects.

One letter in Carafa's correspondence with the Medici, which stands out as more personal and therefore in contrast to the more official tone of the majority of the letters, is the letter of condolence sent by Carafa to Piero on the occasion of Lorenzo's death. In this letter, dated 11 April, 1492, Carafa expresses his sadness at the news of the event and speaks warmly of the love that he held for Piero's father. He urges Piero to be patient in his suffering since: *'contra questa arrivitati de la morte bisogna ne conformiamo con la divina dispositione'*⁸⁹ He also refers to the affection that he has for Piero's brother, Cardinal Giovanni, in whose consecration he had participated. Carafa also undertakes to transfer the love that he held for Lorenzo to his sons. Carafa, as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, would of course have been expected to send a letter of this kind on the event of the death of the nominal head of the Florentine Republic. Nevertheless, despite its conventionally rhetorical style, the letter reads as an expression of genuine regret at the demise of such a remarkable man and shows a close affection for him.

The letters written by Carafa himself are more informative about his professional activities than the copies of letters sent to him by

Lorenzo and Piero's agent, Dionigi Pucci. In a brief letter, dated 2 December, 1472, Lorenzo merely names Francesco Novi as a close friend who would confer with the Cardinal of Sant'Eusebio on his behalf. The import of the second letter written by Lorenzo in February, 1489, to Carafa and six other cardinals has already been discussed. The copy of the third letter sent to Carafa is the last in date and was drafted by Dionigi Pucci on 5 March, 1494, on behalf of Piero de'Medici. In it Pucci refers to a sum of money demanded by the pope and informs Carafa that a proposal to send a smaller amount would be deliberated by the Signoria that day.

Any evaluation of this collection of letters is, by necessity, blunted by the fact that they represent one side of a correspondence and that, in the majority of cases, the outcome of the affairs under discussion is not known. Nevertheless, a number of important facts can be gleaned from an analysis of their contents. From the tone of the letters, Carafa considered himself on equal terms with both Lorenzo and Piero de'Medici. In the case of the latter, he felt that he could adopt a more fatherly tone, due to his age and greater experience. It also appears that Carafa had a well developed sense of his competence and powers as a highly-placed ecclesiastic. In certain areas of the internal affairs of the Florentine Republic, he felt that he had powers of intervention. He evidently saw himself as a person fit to advise on the matter of the appointment of the most important judicial post in Florence. These letters therefore provide crucial information on Carafa's range and variety of professional commitments, and also reveal

him as an integral part of the most influential political and social patronage network flourishing in Renaissance Italy.

Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order.

In addition to defending and promoting the affairs of the kingdom of Naples at the Curia, Cardinal Carafa adopted a similar role for several of the religious orders. In 1478, he became Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order and thereafter worked energetically on their behalf. This mendicant order, distinguished by its zeal for education, preaching (especially against heresy), and defence of papal supremacy, had established itself in a position of theological pre-eminence at the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna and Naples.⁹⁰ Dominican influence also extended to the Vatican itself, where one of the friars acted as master of theology, a position which entailed the supervision of the papal studium and the vetting of all sermons given at the papal court.⁹¹ Due undoubtedly to the Dominican Order's powerful presence in the Curia and in religious life in general, Carafa took a keen interest in the affairs of the Order. Since, moreover, the office of Cardinal Protector had a significant part to play in his patronage of scholarship and art, it is worthwhile expounding a little upon the history and duties of this appointment.⁹²

Before the Reformation, the European nations had a Cardinal Protector who acted as their representative in the Curia and watched over their interests. As has been observed already, Carafa acted in this capacity for the kingdom of Naples. In the thirteenth century, with the rise of

the mendicant orders, a new type of protector appeared, one who would defend the spiritual interests of these orders. The Franciscan Order appears to be the first to have requested from the Pope that its members have such a protector. Soon others followed suit. In the case of the Dominican Order, there was no reference in their constitutions to a Cardinal Protector. Such a figure made an official appearance at the General Chapter held on 1 June, 1376, at Bourges. By 1464, according to one of the ordinations made by the Dominican Congregation of Lombardy, whenever the Vicar General of the Order or his deputy had business to transact with the Curia, he had to present himself and show testimonial letters to either the Cardinal Protector or the Procurator General as intermediaries between the Holy See and the Dominican Order. Accordingly, most of the pontifical correspondence involving the Order passed through the Cardinal Protector's hands. This would entail such business as the reform of convents, settlement of disputes and granting of privileges and graces to members of the Dominican Order.

Initially the Protector held himself aloof from the internal government of the Order and only intervened in extraordinary cases. Since he had no clearly defined authority in the constitutions, his power tended to rely on the autocratic capacity of the individual concerned. Forte's thorough investigation of this issue has led him to conclude that, after Carafa's institution as protector: 'his intervention in the affairs of the order was very frequent, not only as regards the order as a whole, but as regards its individual members, and we may claim this protectorship as the period when the authority of the cardinal-protector reached its zenith'³³

One decisive way that Carafa was able to secure a degree of control over the Dominican Order under his 'protection' was by insuring that a protégé of his was proposed and elected as Master General of the Order. Constitutionally the Dominican Order was governed by a democratic system where all superiors, whether local, provincial, or general, were freely elected at annual chapters, where representatives of the whole Order could freely and openly discuss the affairs of the Order. Carafa, however, intervened in the election of the Master General on several occasions. In 1483, for example, on the death of Salva Cassetta, the General Chapter should have been held in Le Mans under the chairmanship of the Provincial of France. Oliviero Carafa, as Cardinal Protector, intervened and the General Chapter was held in Rome. Sixtus IV named Bartolommeo Comazio as Vicar General on Carafa's advice, but, when on the feast of Pentecost Oliviero Carafa informed the Chapter of the Pope's wishes that Comazio be elected Master General, the electors were in an uproar at this blatant disregard of their liberties. Carafa therefore had to advise Sixtus IV to dissolve the meeting since the Dominicans would not accept his candidate. On 10 October, 1484, under the auspices of the new pope, Innocent VIII, Carafa's nominee, Bartolommeo Comazio (1484-1485) was elected at a General Chapter held in the Roman Dominican priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Such was the notoriety of this election that Burchard refers in his Liber notarum to Carafa's timely intervention. For one modern scholar of the Dominican Order, Mortier: 'décidément, le Cardinal Protecteur devenait le supérieur de l'Ordre et prétendait en diriger les destinées'.⁹⁴

The two subsequent elections of the Master General which were held at SS Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, in 1486 and 1487 respectively, were not so easily subject to Carafa's direct influence. In Mortier's view, the election of Barnabus of Saxony, a member of the reforming Observant wing, was motivated by fear of the Cardinal Protector and the hope that the candidate's ill health would soon free the Order of his rule. By contrast, the election of Joachim Torriani (1487-1500) represented a victory for the Conventuals. Nevertheless, on 12 July, 1488, and 20 June, 1490, Joachim Torriani published a directive to the members of the Order that during his absence from Italy, Oliviero Carafa would have sole jurisdiction over the Order. In Mortier's view: 'il serait intéressant d'étudier jusqu'à quel point les religieux étaient tenus, même sur l'ordre du Maître Général, d'obéir à un prélat séculier'.⁹⁵ Be that as it may, the friars were willing to comply with this instruction and this voluntary delegation of power by the Master General provides evidence of Cardinal Carafa's growing control over the internal affairs of the Dominican Order. As further evidence of this trend, in 1491, the Ferrarese scholar, Ludovico da Ferrara, was summoned by Carafa from his university post in Pavia and at the Cardinal's behest became Procurator General for the Dominicans at the papal Curia.⁹⁶

In the general chapter held at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, on 30 May, 1501, the orthodox Vincenzo Bandello (1501-1506) was elected Master General due to Carafa's influence over the proceedings. (It is of interest that it was the same Vincenzo Bandello who was the prior of Santa Maria delle Grazie in Milan while Leonardo da Vinci was working on the Last Supper in the refectory of that priory.) At the same assembly,

another protégé, Tommaso de Vio, generally known as Cajetan, was made Procurator General. On this occasion, Carafa obtained permission from Alexander VI for the newly-elected Master General to enter the high choir of Saint Peter's during the mass for Pentecost (30 May).⁹⁷

At the election at Pavia of Jean Clérée (1507) as Master General, Oliviero Carafa was able to insure that Cajetan retained his title as Procurator General. On Clérée's death several months later, he recommended to Julius II that Cajetan be made Vicar General of the Order. On 10 June, 1508, the General Chapter opened at Santa Maria sopra Minerva under the presidency of Carafa himself and Cajetan was duly elected Master General (1508-1518). At this assembly, Carafa had been allowed to appoint substitutes for the absent representatives and do 'whatsoever seemed good to him' - a clear testimony of the extent of his control over the Dominican Order by this date.⁹⁸

Perhaps the most dramatic aspect of Carafa's office as Cardinal Protector occurs in his support of the Observant reform movement within the Dominican Order, and more particularly his relations with its principal proponent, Fra Girolamo Savonarola. Carafa first had contact with Savonarola in May, 1493, when the then prior of San Marco enlisted the Cardinal's support for his plan to remove San Marco from the jurisdiction of the Dominican Lombard Congregation and give it independent status under the direct control of Carafa and the current Master General, Joachim Torriani. In order to achieve this objective, Savonarola sent two envoys, Alessandro Rinuccini and Domenico Buonvicini, to Carafa in Rome. Carafa (possibly influenced by Piero

de'Medici, who regarded the Lombard Congregation as under the control of the Duke of Milan and therefore supported Savonarola's scheme) acceded to the envoys' request and on 22 May, 1493, obtained from Alexander VI official approval for this separation.⁹⁹

On 5 July, 1493, Carafa wrote to Piero de'Medici, reporting that some religious from the Lombard Congregation had advised him of factions and disagreements amongst the prior and brothers of San Marco in Florence. In their view, only scandal and disorder could arise from such a situation. Carafa therefore urged Piero to exert his influence and insure that peace return to the priory. By this date, Savonarola had already received Carafa's support in the removal of San Marco from the jurisdiction of the Lombard Congregation. This letter therefore acts as a record of Carafa's hopes that Piero de'Medici would be better able to control a potentially divisive situation now that Savonarola had attained his objective.¹⁰⁰

A year later, Savonarola obtained another victory by the annexation of the convents of San Domenico, Fiesole, and Santa Caterina, Pisa. On this occasion, he did not use the good offices of Cardinal Carafa, but applied directly to Alexander VI through Puccio Pucci, brother-in-law of the Pope's mistress, Giulia Farnese.

After the overthrow of the Medici and the establishment of Savonarola's powerful influence over the republican regime in Florence, there was a growing concern in Rome about the outspoken nature of Savonarola's pronouncements against the papacy and the institutions of the Church.

Once again it was Carafa who obtained papal permission to allow Savonarola to continue to preach. He was apparently still supporting him on 7 September, 1496, when Alexander VI issued a bull uniting all the Dominican convents in Rome and Tuscany into a new Congregation. This Congregation was to be under the jurisdiction of Carafa, who was to have full powers over it for the initial two years, and a Vicar general, who was to be resident in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome. Savonarola denounced the new Congregation publicly and Carafa, disappointed by the friar's lack of co-operation, became noticeably less benevolent towards him.

Carafa was thus unable or unwilling to prevent the excommunication of Savonarola on 13 May, 1497. At that date, he was, in actual fact, in Naples, on a diplomatic mission on behalf of the pope,¹⁰ but he must have been aware of the series of dramatic exchanges between Alexander VI and the Signoria which led to the increasing isolation of Savonarola and his loss of credibility with Florence's ruling élite. Joachim Torriani, as Master General of the Dominican Order, and Cardinal Francesco Remoulins attended Savonarola's trial, Carafa was therefore not involved at first hand with the judgement and subsequent execution of his one-time protégé. In fact, when a delegation from San Marco arrived in Rome to plead on behalf of Savonarola, they found Carafa absent in Naples. Indeed, Carafa had some cause to be thankful for his removal from the scene, since, at the third sitting of the trial, the nature of his relations with Savonarola had been under scrutiny. Savonarola, under torture, had claimed that Carafa had been the prime initiator of a scheme to call a council to overthrow Alexander VI. Twenty-four hours

later Savonarola retracted this statement and Carafa's good reputation was kept intact.¹⁰²

Apart from these central matters involving the administration and government of the Dominican Order, Carafa also supervised and controlled the day-to-day affairs of ordinary friars and nuns. He granted graces and dispensations to individual friars and nuns, assigned certain friars to Dominican houses or asked for their placement in other houses so that they might pursue special courses of study. In 1506, he obtained from Julius II a special brief whereby all friars who had received degrees of any sort had to be re-examined; henceforth no friar might graduate without the express licence of the Cardinal Protector or the Master General. Many of these documents were sealed and dated from his palace in Rome.¹⁰³

Despite the fact that Carafa, in pursuing his office as Cardinal Protector, had encroached upon the power of the Master General, the Dominicans apparently felt that they had benefitted from his powerful patronage. In 1506, Fra Alberto Castello summed up the official view of his Order by stating that the thirty-year rule of the Cardinal Protector had greatly benefitted the order and that it was indebted to his authority, generous gifts and unique protection.¹⁰⁴ Another aspect of Carafa's patronage of the Order, and one that undoubtedly caused further gratitude towards him, was his embellishment of the fabric of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, where he endowed a large and splendidly appointed chapel and furnished the priory with a second cloister. These two foundations will be examined in further detail in chapters four and six.

As a final piece of testimony of the esteem in which Carafa was held by the Dominican Order, it is instructive to study the records of successive General Chapters where Carafa's name appears regularly as one who has been granted an intercessory mass in his honour. The first instance of this privilege occurs in the acts of the General Chapter dated 10 June, 1481. These citations then occur on a regular basis until 11 May, 1505, when the General Chapter held at Sant'Eustorgio, Milan, granted the benefits of the Order and a suffrage of one mass not merely to Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, but also to his brothers and nephews. In 1507 and 1508, one mass was again granted to Carafa. Finally, in 1513, at the General Chapter held in Genoa under the chairmanship of Cajetan, an intercessory mass for the dead, celebrated by each priest of the order, was granted in memory of the Order's recently deceased Cardinal Protector.¹⁰⁵ This extraordinarily generous bequest provides a last vivid instance of the powerful role that Carafa had once played in the Order's affairs and the reputation that he had thereby gained within their collective conscience.

Cardinal Protector of other religious orders

The historical evidence for Carafa's office as Cardinal Protector to two other religious orders - the Vallombrosans and the Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation of Saint Augustine - is not as extensive as in the case of the Dominicans. What does emerge, however, from what little can be pieced together, is that, as in the case of the Dominican Observants, Carafa was interested in promoting reform within these two orders under his protection.

The Vallombrosans, founded in the eleventh century as a reformed religious community wishing to revive the integrity of the Benedictine rule, by the late fifteenth century, owned a number of rich monasteries in Tuscany as well as the priory of Santa Trinita in Florence. While maintaining their long-established constitution of autonomous government in each monastery under freely elected abbots, with an annual meeting of these abbots under the Abbot of Vallombrosa and Abbot General of the Order, the Vallombrosans had suffered the evils of non-residential commendatory abbots.¹⁰⁶ As in the case of the Dominicans, the Order therefore required the assistance of a highly placed cardinal at the Curia to argue the case against such wholesale exploitation of their assets.

In a papal consistory held on 19 February, 1480, Oliviero Carafa persuaded Sixtus IV and the Sacred College to nominate Biagio Milanese, Abbot General of the Order. At that date, Cardinal Stefano Nardini (d. 23 October, 1484) was the official Cardinal Protector of the Vallombrosans, but Carafa was apparently already taking part in the Order's affairs. A papal bull, dated 31 January, 1485, provides evidence that Carafa succeeded Cardinal Nardini as Cardinal Protector of the Vallombrosans. The content of the bull refers to Innocent VIII's decision to entrust the reform of the Order to Carafa, a deacon of the Sacred Rota, Antonio de Grassis, and two other jurists. The bull sanctions the reforms recommended by Carafa and his legal assistants.¹⁰⁷ It was therefore in his capacity as Cardinal Protector elect that Carafa remonstrated in Consistory, in 1483, over Lorenzo de' Medici's seizure of the Vallombrosan abbeys of San Piero in Moscheto, San Michele

at Passignano and San Lorenzo at Coltibuono. In point of fact, he was unable to prevent Giovanni de'Medici receiving these benefices in the consistory held on 24 September, 1488.¹⁰³

During this particular period, Carafa had close contacts with Gabriele Mazzinghi, Abbot of Monte Scalaro, and Procurator General at the Curia. This much is evident from the letter of introduction of 6 April, 1488, supplied by Carafa on behalf of Mazzinghi who had been sent to Florence to discuss with Lorenzo de'Medici an unspecified matter concerning the government of the Vallombrosans.¹⁰⁴ It also appears from Carafa's letter of 2 September, 1488, addressed to Abbot Mazzinghi, that the Procurator General had a part to play in facilitating the matter of Filippino Lippi's employment in Carafa's chapel in Rome. It seems legitimate, therefore, to propose that Lorenzo's act of co-operation in this matter was coloured not only by his wish to attain a cardinal's hat for Giovanni but also by his desire to mitigate Cardinal Carafa's displeasure over the seizure of territory belonging to the Vallombrosan Order. It was also at this particular juncture that the Vallombrosan Order was looking to the Medici regime for support against a dissident faction within the Order's reform party who had taken over several abbeys in Tuscany.¹⁰⁵ All parties were therefore anxious to placate the powerfully placed Cardinal Protector.

Five years later, Carafa again took up the cause of the Vallombrosan Order. In a letter dated 14 September, 1493, and addressed to Piero de'Medici in Florence, Carafa reports that Abbot Mazzinghi had informed him that a group of Carmelites had arrived in Florence, and obtained

permission from the Signoria to take possession of San Giorgio, which had hitherto belonged to the Vallombrosan Order. In Carafa's view this action would reflect badly on the reputations of both Piero and his brother, Cardinal [Giovanni] de'Medici, and that if certain citizens had a special devotion towards the Carmelite Order, they could build a house elsewhere. He therefore strongly urges that the rights of the Vallombrosans be upheld.'''

Carafa's office of Cardinal Protector of the Canons Regular of the Lateran, (a relatively new order resulting from a reform initiative undertaken by Ludovico Barbo in the early decades of the fifteenth century''²) receives its principal testimony in the inscriptions''³ incorporated in the cloister and conventual buildings which Carafa had built between 1500 and 1504 beside the church of Santa Maria della Pace in Rome. The history of the Canons Regular at this church belongs more properly in chapter five, where this project is discussed in greater detail. Although Carafa's appointment as Cardinal Protector of this reform order is not securely documented, in all probability he succeeded Cardinal Giovanni Arcimboldi who died on 2 October, 1488. As with the other orders with whom he was associated, his interest in the affairs of the Canons began some years before this appointment, since on 20 September, 1483, he attended the ceremony which marked the Canons taking possession of their new church and parish.'''⁴

From this examination of Carafa's actions as Cardinal Protector, one feature stands out in sharp relief - his willingness to support and promote reform initiatives taken within these religious orders''⁵ and in

the case of the Vallombrosans to protect the Order from some of the most flagrant acts of commendation perpetrated upon it. He may also have insured that one of the monasteries that he himself held in commendam was reformed. According to one seventeenth-century Neapolitan historian, Carafa united the Benedictine monastery of Montevergine (which he received in 1485) with the Congregation of Santa Giustina in Padua, reserving a pension during his lifetime.¹¹⁶ Early in the fifteenth century, Ludovico Barbo had instituted a reformed Observance at Santa Giustina which was adopted by other Benedictine monasteries, resulting in a new Congregation who held its first chapter in 1421.¹¹⁷ There is no evidence other than Chioccarello's account of Carafa's part in this reform movement. Since, however, the new Congregation also involved the reform of the Canons Regular to whom Carafa acted as Cardinal Protector, the account is probably substantially accurate.

Carafa and reform

Carafa's expertise in canon law, which Ferrante had utilised early in Carafa's career as Archbishop of Naples, enabled him to match his evident concern for the reform of the Church with practical action.¹¹⁸ Thus on 8 September, 1494, Carafa published under his seal as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina an appendix of new reforming constitutions to supplement the existing constitutions for the suburbicarian bishopric of Sabina.¹¹⁹ Three years later he was furnished with a greater opportunity to effect reform within the Church. Following the personal crisis experienced by Alexander VI over the death of his son, the Duke of Gandia, on 14 June 1497, the pope announced in the public consistory

of 19 June that he had decided to institute a commission of leading ecclesiastics to investigate the possibilities for the reform of the Curia. Due to his judicial expertise and his high moral standing, Carafa was appointed to this commission together with Cardinals Giorgio Costa, Antonio Pallavicino, Antonio di San Giorgio, Francesco Piccolomini and Raffaele Riario, Guillaume Pérès and a fellow auditor of the Rota, a bishop and various other collaborators. Two partly unpublished documents in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana represent the fruits of these labours.¹²⁰ The first is a preparatory work following the directions of the six cardinals. The second contains the text of the reform project and as it includes a report compiled by Carafa himself is therefore of greater interest.

In this large volume entitled Reformationes, the scope of the reform proposals is indicated by the various section headings - reform of the Chancery, Penitentiary, protonotaries etc. Between folios 53-109, the text lists the reforms introduced under various popes, beginning with Martin V and ending with those of Alexander VI. Folios 110^r-114^v contain the memorial composed by Carafa himself (and copied in an early sixteenth-century hand), as indicated by the passage: 'composita a bo[n]e[m] m[em]or[ia]e R[everendissim]o Car[dinalli] Neapolitani p[ro]l reformatione[m] st[atu]s pontificis Alexandri VI et eius palatii et Curie'. As an example of Carafa's recommendations the instruction in the first paragraph of the memorial is instructive. It runs: 'mulieres igitur q[ue]l vinculo consanguinitatis aut affinitatis attinent Ro[mano] pontifici, nullo modo possint habitare intra septa b[eat]i Petri neq[ue]l in burgo neq[ue]l ingredi palatium apostolicum'.¹²¹ Here Carafa

is advising that women, even blood relatives of the pope, should not be allowed to live in the Borgo or enter the Vatican palace. This prohibition was almost certainly directed at Alexander VI, whose daughter, Lucrezia, and mistresses were often resident in the Vatican.

Elsewhere the document condemns the widespread sale of sacred offices, the practice of non-resident clergy and the reservation of clerical benefices not yet vacant. Carafa's memorandum thus returns to a recurrent theme of fifteenth and sixteenth-century reform - the need to eradicate the three classic abuses of simony, pluralism and nepotism. While it is clear from the tone of the document that Carafa deplored the venality and fiscal practices of the Roman Curia, nowhere is there the sense that he was opposing the pope's right to obtain income in this manner. It does not read as a revolutionary statement in any way but, rather, as a very orthodox declaration relying to a great degree on past tradition and precedent as embodied in medieval canon law. As will be discussed in the following chapter, Carafa's private library once housed seminal legal texts of this very type.¹²² Moreover, Carafa himself was far from being untainted by the very practices about which he was expressing concern. He was most certainly a non-resident pluralist, he exploited the practice of 'reservation' and 'resignation' of church benefices on behalf of his family and clients, and was, in short, guilty of nepotism.

Carafa's dilemma in this respect is aptly summed up by Hallman in her recent study of Renaissance cardinals and their monopoly of church property: 'the vast bulk of cardinals' incomes . . . came from

ecclesiastical benefices. The situation meant that any reform of the benefice system would directly impinge upon the personal finances of the very men to whom the labours of reforms were entrusted'.¹²³ While Hallman's remarks arise from her assessment of reform initiatives undertaken in the sixteenth century, they apply to Cardinal Carafa's position as a major benefice-holder. Despite the evidently sincere effort that had gone into its compilation, Carafa's reform memorial and its recommendations singularly failed to implement measures which forced the cardinals to practice self-restraint as regards the number of church offices accumulated for financial gain alone (unlike those undertaken between 1555 and 1557 by his relative, Paul IV¹²⁴). The reform bull, 'in apostolicae sedis specula', remained unpublished and the reform initiative therefore had negligible impact. The papal court of Alexander VI was hardly the place to hope for any serious or sustained programme of reform against the endemic venal practices of the Catholic Church at that date.

Wealth and reputation

Carafa died in Rome on 22 January, 1511. He had already made provisions for his death in his will made on 12 March, 1509. This manuscript document (Pl. 1), written by him (*mea propria manu scripsi*) and authenticated by a notary as autograph (*manu propria ipsius reverendissimi domini Cardinalis*)¹²⁵ offers valuable insight into certain aspects of Carafa's patronage and is, therefore, worth summarizing in some detail. In order to circumvent any danger of post-mortem challenge, he names his chief heirs as his brothers, Carlo, Count

of Airola, and Ettore Carafa, and his nephews (sons of his deceased brother, Fabrizio), Vincenzo, Archbishop of Naples, Antonio and Jacopo.¹²⁶ In order that their legal claims be recognised he appoints two high-ranking cardinals as executors of his will, Giovanni di San Giorgio, Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and Palestrina, and Niccolò Fieschi, Cardinal Presbyter of Santa Prisca (and, incidently, destined to be Carafa's successor as Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order).¹²⁷ Finally, the witnesses to the will are his secretary, the humanist, Giovanni Battista Almadiano, and five of the most powerfully placed men in the Dominican Order, Cajetan, the current Master General, Nicholas Schömberg, the Procurator General, Benedetto da Foiano, Master in theology at the Sacred Palace, Mariano da Roma, the prior of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and Antonio da Caramanico, the regent of the Minerva.¹²⁸

The document opens with the customary preamble setting out the reasons for drawing up the will - an awareness of the transitory nature of human life and the necessity of disposing of one's temporal goods. This is followed by a clearly-worded instruction that the Cardinal's body be laid in the tomb beside his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva and then transferred to the tomb in the chapel of Saint Januarius in the cathedral in Naples. His burial is to be effected modestly and without pomp. He then leaves the customary annual bequest of fifty gold ducats to the Pope with the rider that the Pope protect his and his family's honour.

The will then lists the endowments given by the Cardinal to a number of churches in Rome for the performance of requiem masses. The individual

amounts are given in ducats at the rate of ten carlini per ducat. The churches mentioned belong to a number of religious orders. Naturally the Dominican churches of Santa Maria sopra Minerva and San Sisto figure prominently in this list, but he also gives endowments to named churches belonging to the Franciscan, Augustinian and Carmelite Orders. He also gives sums of money to a number of hospitals for alms and leaves an endowment, in the form of a rent on a house, to the confraternity of the Annunziata with the request that its members process to his chapel at Santa Maria sopra Minerva on the feast of the Birth of the Virgin.

The bequests then take the form of gifts or funds for the repair of buildings. For example, he leaves two hundred ducats to the monastery of Sant'Eusebio for the repair of their property. He makes the generous bequest of all his books on theology, philosophy, civil and canon law to the library that he had had built at Santa Maria della Pace. To his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, he gives paramenta in the form of a small silver cross, two candlesticks, a number of different sets of vestments (one of which was to be used for the office of the dead), and two large tapestries depicting Adam and Eve to be used on the feasts of the Annunciation, Birth of the Virgin and Saint Thomas Aquinas. To the Succorpo he leaves a large silver crucifix.

His household are to receive two thousand ducats and his horses - a very valuable item of any Renaissance person's property. He entrusts his executors with the task of rewarding the individual members of his household according to the length and quality of their service. In order to make their task lighter, he affirms that he has already

disposed of his moveable property, giving some of it away and valuing the remainder. He also instructs his executors to release the goods belonging to the Church (in other words, the numerous benefices that he personally held at the time of his death).

The will ends with the customary fail-safe clauses. Carafa then concedes to his executors full powers to execute his last wishes and requests them to take care in memory of his soul, and his honour, and that of his heirs and family. He signs and seals it with his signet ring on 12 March, 1509. The witnesses then add their names and the will is given its legal authentication by the attendant notary.

Carafa's will follows the standard format of other fifteenth and sixteenth-century cardinals' wills in that it names his heirs, invokes the support of powerful executors and witnesses, gives instructions on the funeral arrangements, acknowledges the need to reward his household and lists bequests to churches and monasteries.¹²⁹ Unlike a close colleague, Cardinal Marco Barbo (d. 1491) who during his lifetime had reduced his inheritance to a few denari,¹³⁰ Carafa appears to have left his heirs a substantial legacy. What the document is silent upon is precisely what this legacy entailed and what percentage of it arose from ecclesiastical property.

During his lifetime, Carafa amassed great wealth, although the historical evidence for such an assertion has to be sought from a number of diverse sources. In the absence of the records between 1479 and 1534 of the camera (treasury) of the Sacred College, it is not possible to be

definite about the share or 'division' of the College's corporate income to which Carafa, as a cardinal resident in Rome, was entitled. These 'divisions' held three or four times a year never approached anything like the annual income of six thousand ducats or more that the cardinals decided was their entitlement at the conclave of Julius II.¹³¹ Carafa would have also received approximately a thousand ducats per annum from the taxes made on the major benefices by papal provision; income from his administrative position as papal legate to the Campagna; and additional sources of revenue and perquisites from the huge estates of his suburbacarian title of Cardinal Bishop.¹³²

The main source of his income undoubtedly came from the innumerable ecclesiastical benefices accumulated by him during his lifetime, purely as a source of perpetual income and not as a spiritual and pastoral obligation. The number and variety of Carafa's principal benefices can be judged from Table III where they are listed according to the date of acquisition. These, however, only refer to the most public of Carafa's benefices - major episcopal and monastic titles - which he had granted to him in public consistory. He undoubtedly had claim to many lesser benefices and to the pensions from these benefices. In the case of the latter, since they carried no responsibility for administration of the sacred office they could be freely assigned to relatives and retainers, transferred to the cardinal's heirs and disappear within his personal estate.¹³³

On hearing of Carafa's death in 1511, Sanuto, by naming the value of Carafa's benefices as twelve thousand ducats a year, immediately

expressed the concern felt at the Curia when any prelate made wealthy by extensive church property died.¹³⁴ Burchard had earlier cited Carafa in the assessment for the crusade tax of 1501 as having an annual income of ten thousand ducats.¹³⁵ As Chambers shrewdly points out, this assessment: 'probably takes no account of private income let alone capital assets of property and valuables'.¹³⁶

Carafa's wealth as a cardinal rentier and pluralist would have been offset by the need to maintain himself as a prince of the Church, offer hospitality, and keep a large household. In other words he probably had: 'to live on a delicate but complex structure of credit and expenses which nearly always outfaced receipts'.¹³⁷ Carafa never had a titular church with a palace attached to it (as for example, San Marco did). Nor did he go to the expense of building a palace for himself, which would have cost him at least fifteen thousand ducats. Instead he preferred to rent a palace from the Orsini family. Judging from the rents for other palaces of an equivalent size, the annual rent would have been between two hundred and four hundred ducats. Other large items of expense would have been the purchase of land on the Quirinal to build a villa as a suburban retreat and the acquisition of a library and collection of antiques.¹³⁸

No contracts survive to indicate the precise cost of Carafa's two major artistic commissions - the chapel and tomb chamber in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, and the Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples. In the case of the Succorpo, the entry in Giuliano Passero's chronicle gives the total cost of the project as fifteen thousand ducats.¹³⁹ In the case of

the Roman chapel, Vasari quotes the sum of two thousand ducats for Filippino Lippi's labour over and above the cost of the ultramarine pigment and the wages of Filippino's assistants.¹⁴⁰ He gives no source for his information. Comparison with the payment given to other painters involved in fresco schemes of a similar scale shows this sum to be very generous. As Borsook has pointed out, the contrast between the sum of two thousand ducats and the sum of three hundred florins, quoted by Filippo Strozzi as payment to Filippino for his work on the Strozzi chapel, is striking. Lehmkuhl cites the sum given by Vasari without question but points out that Roman commissions in general commanded higher prices than Florentine ones. In Borsook's view the price is still very high even by Roman standards and she concludes that the sum may have been for marble and other adornments.¹⁴¹

All these prices are of course relative. Compared to the sums paid by other contemporary patrons, Carafa does seem to have been paying a lot for his artistic projects. Taken in the context of his overall income, however, he could well afford such prices. The sums quoted by Passero and Vasari are probably based on accurate information and as such provide compelling evidence of Carafa's willingness to pay well for artistic schemes that he chose to inaugurate.

In his will, Carafa also stated that many of his possessions, movable and immovable, had already been distributed and that others would be released at his death.¹⁴² These must refer to property which had derived from ecclesiastical 'goods' - income from cathedrals, cardinalate churches and monasteries. He had also obtained, several

years earlier on 24 March, 1502, permission from Alexander VI to bequeathe to his brothers, Alessandro and Ettore, two properties which should have reverted to the Church on his death. These were the chapel of the Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples and the suburban villa on the Quirinal.¹⁴³ Thus while the licence from Alexander VI did not provide, as in certain cases,¹⁴⁴ total freedom for Carafa to bequeath all his possessions to his heirs, he had, in this instance, been able to alienate certain church property on behalf of his family. The very fact that he had been allowed to make a will at all is indicative of this fact. One suspects, moreover (although it cannot be proved from documentary sources so far identified), that Carafa's private estate had greatly benefitted from the siphoning off of income from ecclesiastical benefices in the form of pensions.

He certainly took care, at all events, to ensure that his close relatives gained control of a number of important and lucrative ecclesiastical benefices. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of the archbishopric of Naples, the most politically powerful and wealthiest sacred office in southern Italy. On 29 September, 1484, Carafa ceded his title of Archbishop to his brother, Alessandro, who at that time was also resident in Rome as an apostolic protonotary. In the papal brief dealing with his resignation, Carafa retained the right in the event of his brother's death to take the title back again. When Alessandro died in July, 1503, Carafa duly re-acquired the title of Archbishop of Naples.¹⁴⁵ He kept it until 1505, when he ceded it to a close relative, Bernardino Carafa, while taking over Bernardino's title of Archbishop of Chieti. At the death of Bernardino, a few months

later, he again became Archbishop, only to award the title to his nephew, Vincenzo, in the same year.¹⁴⁶ What emerges from this complicated pattern of exchanged titles is that Carafa was determined to retain the prestigious and financially lucrative office within his family's control; he was willing to exploit the widespread and potentially corrupt practice of regressus, and treat the archbishopric of Naples as a kind of hereditary fief of the Carafa.¹⁴⁷

His partiality towards the interests of his family is also evident from his patronage of his young relative, Gian Pietro Carafa (the future Paul IV), whom he took into his household and on whose behalf he acquired a succession of ecclesiastical titles.¹⁴⁸ His power of recommendation for benefices also benefitted members of his household, such as Jacopo Sadoletto for whom he acquired a canonicate in the Roman church of San Lorenzo in Damaso.¹⁴⁹ As a powerful prelate, he was also able to use his wealth and political influence to obtain remunerative secular positions for members of his family by buying the title of the Count of Ruvo for his younger brother, Ettore.¹⁵⁰ This act provides another compelling instance of the preoccupation that Italian ecclesiastics had for the health and grandezza of their family and the unrepentant way that they used the wealth of the Church to achieve such an end.

At his death, Carafa received many tributes which allude to his exemplary mode of life, his sagacity and integrity. On hearing the news of his death, Julius II, for example, wrote:

Gravem animi dolorem accepimus audito obitu beatae memoriae Oliverii Episcopi Ostiensis Cardinalis Neapolitani nuncupati erat enim firmissima Sanctae Apostolicae sedis columna, cuius consilio utpote sapientis et optimi viri libenter in gravibus rebus utebamur.¹⁵¹

Amongst the many virtues cited by Sadoletto in Carafa's funeral oration, his frugality stands out as an unusual quality for a cardinal in late fifteenth-century Rome.¹⁵² In another verse oration composed by Marco Girolamo Vida, a member of the Canons Regular and the Order's community at Santa Maria della Pace, fulsome compliments are made about Carafa's role as Protector of the Order and benefactor of Santa Maria della Pace. In Vida's opinion, Carafa's life was blameless and dedicated to religion.¹⁵³

Paris de Grassis (papal master of ceremonies, 1504-1528), follows his predecessor, Burchard, in describing Carafa as an authoritative and respected figure.¹⁵⁴ In four out of the five references made by Sigismondo de'Conti in his history, the Cardinal is characterised as a man of learning, probity, wisdom, integrity and prudence.¹⁵⁵ Likewise Cortese in his treatise on the cardinalature cites Carafa as an exemplar on a number of counts, his sagacity in Consistory; his promotion of the Dominican theologian, Cajetan; and his sponsorship of an 'erudite programme' for his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva.¹⁵⁶

Although we can recognise the literary conventions of the time which customarily employed this complimentary style of address, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa does seem to have been a person who took seriously his

religious and political duties as a prince of the Church. While his all-too-ready wholesale acquisition of sacred offices might well be construed as corrupt, by the standards of time they were tolerated and possibly even regarded as a virtue since they represented his loyalty towards family, friends and clients.

What, therefore, are the most significant aspects of this biographical account for Cardinal Oliviero Carafa as a patron? Carafa belonged to a wealthy Neapolitan family who owned extensive property in and around Naples and who had a history of loyal service to the Aragonese rulers of southern Italy. His uncle Diomede, in particular, presented Carafa with an exemplum of a magnanimous and learned patron of architecture and humanist studies.¹⁵⁷ Despite the fact that, after his elevation to cardinal, Carafa spent most of his time in Rome with only an occasional visit to his home town, he continued to act as 'godfather' to his family, using his high position to protect and promote their affairs. He assiduously procured ecclesiastical or secular property for his relatives. At times of political upheaval in the kingdom, he secured from the likely victor the promise of protection for members of his family. Above all, he deemed the archiepiscopal see as his family's property, keeping the title within his control from 1464 until his death. These twin emotions - Neapolitan campanilismo and loyalty towards his gens - provided the essential motivation for his commission of the chapel of the Succorpo built in the heart of what might justifiably be termed his cathedra.

Carafa's career as a cardinal was markedly successful. Due in part to his longevity, but more to his abilities, he worked his way up through the ranks of cardinal presbyter, cardinal bishop and finally to the highest position in the Sacred College, that of dean and Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. He was clearly considered papabile for at least three of the five papal elections in which he participated. His failure to obtain the papal tiara was due to his inability (or lack of inclination) to obtain the necessary backing of politically powerful individuals who had influence in the electoral college.

As cardinal, Carafa also played a leading role in the public ceremonial that characterised fifteenth-century diplomacy. Frequent references are made in contemporary accounts and in Burchard's diary to Carafa's attendance at receptions and processions through the streets of Rome. He thus had a highly public profile and was seen to be a person of some consequence, whose support would be invaluable in certain situations. As cardinal, he was also required to act as a celebrant or attend mass in the presence of the pope. Burchard describes Carafa as scrupulous on details of liturgical practice.¹⁵² As will be seen in chapters four and five, this preoccupation of Carafa's will have a bearing on the style and function of his two chapel foundations.

His official designation as Cardinal of Naples also acts as a clear indication of his status as representative of the kingdom of Naples at the papal court. As seen in the above account of Carafa's relations with the kings of Naples, it is not always clear who was patron and who the petitioner. In the early stages of his career, Carafa was indebted

to the patronage and support of Ferrante, but once he had gained a position of influence within the Curia, he could afford to take a more independant line and defend more robustly his own interests and those of his dependants.

His acknowledged status and position at the papal Curia enabled him to treat on equal terms with the Medici as de facto rulers of Florence. As further proof of the respect held for his diplomatic and judicial skills, references to his advice and powers of mediation appear regularly in the dispatchs of various ambassadors attached to the Holy See.

While maintaining a stance of loyalty to successive popes, Carafa was also not afraid to defend the interests of the religious orders placed under his protection, even when, on occasions, these ran counter to the political imperatives of either the pope or the secular rulers in whose territory the order's religious communities resided. He also maintained an interest in, and offered his support to, reform initiatives within these orders as well as within his own bishopric of Sabina and the papal Curia. His patronage of the Dominican Order extended beyond administrative and judicial matters to encompass cultural patronage. In his guise of mecenate, Carafa offered his support both to Dominican scholarship and to the embellishment of the Order's principal church and priory in Rome. A similar pattern of mecenatismo can be discerned in his endowments to the church and convent of the Canons Regular at Santa Maria della Pace in Rome.

The foregoing survey of Carafa's biography thus reveals a number of themes which are integral to an adequate understanding of Carafa's intentions and achievements as a patron. First and foremost there is the recognition that Carafa's patronage is multi-faceted and not confined merely to either artistic, or intellectual, or political, or ecclesiastical endeavours, but rather that all these aspects were contingent upon one another. Second, an underlying motive of Carafa's patronage was his commitment to his family, as revealed by his energetic promotion of his relatives' interests and his contribution to the fabric of family monuments in Naples. Third, and contributory to his family loyalty, was his patriotism towards his home town of Naples whose interests he defended in his capacity as Cardinal and Archbishop of Naples. Fourth, came his commitment as a prince of the Church towards certain religious orders for whom he had been assigned special responsibilities. These special duties as a patron of religious orders directly impinged upon and affected the mode and style of the intellectual and artistic endeavours to which he gave his support. Finally, enmeshed within these collective concerns, Carafa's patronage undoubtedly served to bolster his personal reputation and to perpetuate his memory. This intention is very evident from the various genres and forms that his scholarly and artistic sponsorship took. The following chapters therefore examine these patterns of motivation (as deduced from Carafa's career as ecclesiastic and patron) and assesses their impact upon specific acts of mecenatismo carried out during his lifetime.

Notes to Chapter 2

¹Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples, MS XIV E8, 'Oratio Jacobi Sadoleti in funere Oliverii Carrafae Cardinalis Neapolitani habita in aede Minervae Romae anno domini MDXI'. There is another copy transcribed in the nineteenth century in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV), Vat. lat. 9539, fols. 399^r-409^v. An explanatory covering letter from Dr. Giovanni Rossi to Cardinal Mai, dated 8 April, 1846, appears on fols. 410-11. The oration is published by A. Altamura, 'Il cardinale Oliviero Carafa in un'orazione inedita del Sadoletto', Rassegna storica napoletana, n.s. I (1940), pp. 317-25. For discussion of Carafa's patronage of Sadoletto, see below, chapter 2, p. 74; chapter 3, pp. 121-3.

²A. Chacón, Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S.R.E. Cardinalium (Rome, 1677), Vol. II, cols. 1097-1105; L. Cardella, Memorie storiche de' Cardinali della Santa Romana Chiesa (Rome, 1793), Vol. III, pp. 159-163. A number of references to Carafa appear in Pastor, History of the Popes, IV-VI, *passim*.

³B. Chioccarello, Antistitum praeclarissimae neapolitanae ecclesiae catalogus (Naples, 1643), pp. 286-309; B. Aldimari, Historia genealogica della famiglia Carafa (Naples, 1691), Vol. III, pp. 8-27; the commemorative piece in D. Zigarelli, Storia di Benevento: biografie dei vescovi e arcivescovi della chiesa di Napoli (Naples, 1861), pp. 100-5, belongs to the same genre as Chioccarello.

⁴F. Scandone, et. al., 'I Carafa di Napoli', in Famiglie celebri di Italia of P. Litta (2nd ser., Naples, 1913), Vol. I, tav. XIX. The documents of especial interest are cited as Pergamene, nos. 97-49, 98, 105, 114, 124, 237, 289-11-123, and mostly entail property transactions made in Rome on behalf of Carafa.

⁵F. Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa mecenate del Rinascimento', Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana, n.s. XIV (1964-5), pp. 139-61.

⁶F. Petrucci, 'Oliviero Carafa', Dizionario biografico degli Italiani (henceforth DBI), (Rome, 1976), Vol. XIX, pp. 588-96. See also my forthcoming entry, 'Oliviero Carafa', in The Dictionary of Art (companion to The New Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians). Less informative references to Carafa can also be found in Enciclopedia Cattolica (Città del Vaticano, 1949), Vol. III, col. 743; Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti (4th ed., Milan, 1930), Vol. VIII, p. 931; New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1967), Vol. III, pp. 97-8.

⁷R. de Maio, Savonarola e la Curia romana (Rome, 1969).

⁸There are various accounts of the origins and etymology of the Carafa. F. Campanile, L'armi, ovvero insegne de' nobili (Naples, 1610), pp. 50-1, refers to a number of fourteenth-century tomb inscriptions in Naples which state that the name derives from and is linked with the Caraccioli. S. Ammirato, Delle famiglie nobili napoletane (Florence, 1651), Vol. II, p. 139, also refers to blood ties with the Gianfigliuzzi of Florence and the Caraccioli of Naples. Aldimari, Historia

genealogica, I, pp. 46-50, also refers to the Caraccioli but begins his biographies with Stefano Sigismondo, king of Sardinia, whose mother's name was Cara - hence the derivation of the family name from cara and filii. B. Candida Gonzaga, Memorie delle famiglie nobili delle province meridionali d'Italia (Naples, 1875), Vol. I, p. 173, describes another family legend when a member of the Sigismondi family saved the life of the Hohenstaufen Emperor, Henry VI, who uttered the words, 'cara fe mi e la tua'. R. Jenkins, The story of the Caraffa (London, 1886), pp. 22-4, refers to a further elaboration of this story - namely that Henry VI invented the Carafa coat of arms (gules, three fesses argent) by drawing three fingers across the bloody stain on the harness of his gallant saviour.

⁹Aldimari, ibid., I, pp. 40-6, discusses the relative antiquity of the two branches of the family, but concludes that the Spina were the more ancient. Jenkins, ibid., p. 21, points out that since the Spina had added a thorn to their coat of arms, whereas the Stadera had no such addition, the Carafa della Stadera were entitled to claim precedence over the Spina.

¹⁰For Francesco, see Aldimari, ibid., III, pp. 3-7; Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX. For Diomede, see Aldimari, ibid., II, pp. 74-95; Scandone, ibid., tav. XXXIV; M. Persico, Diomede Carafa uomo di stato e scrittore del secolo XV (Naples, 1899); F. Petrucci, 'Diomede Carafa', DBI, Vol. XIX, pp. 524-30.

¹¹Due to his friendship with Lorenzo de' Medici, Diomede was of particular use to Ferrante in the negotiations that brought about the agreement between Florence and Naples to end the 1478-80 war. J. Moores, 'New light on Diomede Carafa and his "perfect loyalty" to Ferrante of Aragon', Italian studies, XXVI (1971), pp. 1-23, argues convincingly for Diomede's skill as a shrewd politician on the basis of surviving letters exchanged between Diomede and Lorenzo.

¹²Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, p. 4; Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX.

¹³Scandone, ibid., differs in a number of details from the genealogy set out in Table I. He names Oliviero as Francesco's second son and Alessandro as his seventh by his second wife. The papal master of ceremonies, Johannes Burchard, Liber notarum, ed. E. Celani, Rerum Italicarum scriptores (henceforth RIS), (Città di Castello, 1907), Vol. XXXII, 1, p. 463, however, refers to Alessandro and Oliviero Carafa as children of the same parents: 'Alexander Caraffa, archiepiscopus neapolitanus, frater germanus r. d. cardinalis Neapolitani'.

¹⁴Archivio storico diocesano, Naples, 'Testamento di Car^o Oliviero', fol. [3v]: 'facio et instituo meos universales heredes excellentem dom[ini] Carolum Carraffa, comitem Ayrole et domilnum Ethorum Carraffa militem fratres meos germanos, et Archiepiscopum [Vincenzo] Antonium et Iacobum Carraffa meos nepotes natus ex domino Fracibio meo fratre germano'. The MS is not paginated so I have taken the first page of text as folio 1. The document was given to the diocesan archive on

25 January, 1964, by Duke Riccardo Carafa d'Andria as part of a set of documents attesting to the validity of the relics of Saint Januarius, housed in the family chapel of the Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples. See below chapter 5, and A. Caserta and G. Lambertini, Storia e scienza di fronte al miracolo di S. Gennaro (Naples, 1986), p. 49. The document has been published by Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', pp. 148-152.

¹⁵Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 286. P. Santamaria, Historia collegii patrum canonicorum metropolitanae ecclesiae neapolitanae: ultima eius origine ad hac usque tempora, (Naples, 1900), p. 525, lists him under 'Canonici certae sedis: presbyteri cardinales', with the title of S. Mariae ad Cimbros.

¹⁶Sadoletus, 'Oratio in funere', fol. 403^{r/v}: 'hoc ille et loco et genere natus, ut primum ingenue ac liberaliter educatus, studiis quoque puerilibus est imbutus, in florentissima Italiae gymnasia missus et ad ius civili et pontificium capessendum. Perusiam primo, inde Ferrariam, ubi, cum maximam laudem non solum ingenii, sed etiam modestiae ac probitatis ab omnibus litterarum studiosis et illarum civitatum principibus consequeretur, stipendiis disciplinae iam confectis, absens Pontifex Neapolitanus factus est'.

¹⁷Diario concistoriale del Cardinale Ammanati attributo dal Muratori a Giacomo Gherardi di Volterra, ed. E. Carusi, RIS, Vol. XXIII, 3, p. 143.

¹⁸In a letter dated 12 April, 1493, to the government of Lucca on the question of Jewish money-lending, Sandei refers to an exchange between Carafa and himself when Carafa called Alessandro da Imola (Tartagna) his preceptor, but urges Sandei in this particular instance to go against Tartagna's judgement. The letter is published by De Maio, Savonarola, pp. 228-232, esp. p. 231. For Alessandro Tartagna (1423/4-1477), see F. Savigny, Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter (Heidelberg, 1831), Vol. VI, pp. 271-77.

¹⁹Hay, Church in Italy, pp. 99-100.

²⁰Paulus Cortesius, 'De iure canonico', in De cardinalitu (Castro Cortesi, 1510), Liber I, cap. VI, fols. 32^r-35^r (erratic page numeration).

²¹Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 286. Zigarelli, Storia di Benevento, pp. 90-100, lists Carafa's immediate predecessors. Cardinal Rinaldo Piscicelli had died in 1457 and had been buried in the cathedral of Naples. Cardinal Giacomo Teobaldeschi was given the title in 1458 but renounced it three months later.

²²Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX, cites a number of documents where Carafa appears as arbiter on a number of legal transactions involving property belonging to the see of Naples. One of these cites his father, Francesco, and his properties at Torre del Greco, Portici and Resina. It appears from a signed petition of 1466, quoted by Chioccarello,

ibid., p. 287, that Carafa held his court in the archbishop's palace in Naples.

²³For further discussion of the the composition and powers of the Sacro Regio Consiglio, see Ryder, Kingdom of Naples, esp. pp. 103-118. According to G. Capaccio, 'Napoli descritta ne'principii del secolo XVII', Archivio storico per le province napoletane, VII (1882), p. 789, Carafa's father, Francesco, had been a non-judicial member of the Sacro Regio Consiglio.

²⁴Sadoletus, 'Oratio in funere', fol. 403v: 'ita reversus in patriam, cum et prudentissimi Regis iudicium et suorum civium expectationem praesens virtute ac diligentia superasset, Princeps consilii publici in ea civitate est institutus: in quo munere gravi et laborioso novem versatus annos, ea doctrinae et integritatis documenta praebuit, ut quaecumque ipse constitutuisset, haec omnes tamquam ex fontibus iusticiae et veritatis deprompta arbitratentur'. Sadoletus states here that Carafa's term of office lasted nine years. Chiccarello, Antistitum, p.286, gives 1465 as the date of Carafa's appointment. Carafa may well have acted in this capacity from 1465-1474.

²⁵These letters are published in F. Trinchera, Codice Aragonese (Naples, 1866), Vol. I, pp. 33-6, docs. XXIII-V. In his letter to the Sacred College, dated 5 February, 1467, Ferrante writes: 'le singulare soe [*sic*] virtute et grande amore, che nui portiamo al R.^{mo} archiepiscopo neapolitano et ad tucta sua casa . . . che ad nui pare assay honesta che quisso [*sic*] nostro regno non debeat stare tanto tempo senza cardinale et etiam ne pare meritare questa complacentia de la sede apostolica'.

²⁶There appears to be differences of opinion amongst early writers on the year of Carafa's promotion. See Chacon, Vitae et res gestae, II, col. 1098, and Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 287-8, who give the correct date as confirmed by the entry in the Atti del Concistoro (cited in Pastor, History of the Popes, IV, p. 120, n.). Amongst the eight cardinals of this creation were Marco Barbo (Paul II's nephew), Francesco della Rovere (later Sixtus IV), and an Englishman, Thomas Bouchier.

²⁷Chiccarello, *ibid.*, p. 228. The creation of a cardinal traditionally took place in secret consistory. In the next public consistory, the scarlet hat was given to him after he had taken the customary oath. At the following secret consistory the ceremony of the opening and closing the mouth (aperitio et clausura oris) took place and the new cardinal was presented with the ring and title of his cardinalate church. See 'Cardinals, II (Canon Law of)', New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1967), Vol. III, pp. 105-6. For public and secret consistories, see below note 28.

²⁸Public consistories were the meetings where the most important papal decisions and pronouncements were made, embassies received and important benefices conferred. In secret consistories the administrative work was done - the business of proposing prebends, bishoprics and abbeys. It was there that the cardinals received their

gratuity (propina) for proposing candidates for vacant benefices. G. Alberigo, Cardinalato e collegialità: studi sull'ecclesiologia tra l'XI e il XVI secolo (Florence, 1969), discusses ecclesiastical doctrine concerning the functions of the cardinals and the Sacred College. See also Antonovics, 'Counter-Reformation cardinals', pp. 301-28.

²⁹A. d'Amato, 'Vicende dell'osservanza regolare nella Congregazione Domenicana di Lombardia negli anni 1469-72', AFP, XV (1945), p. 64. Three other cardinals - Bessarion, Angelo Capranica and Marco Barbo - were also on this commission.

³⁰Carafa's titles and benefices are listed in Table III.

³¹Atti del Concistoro, 23 December, 1471, cited by Pastor, History of the Popes, IV, p. 129. Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 290, refers to Carafa's appointment as legate to France to replace Cardinal Bessarion who had died at Ravenna. Petrucci, 'Oliviero Carafa', p. 589, also gives credence to this appointment.

³²According to the calculations of Setton, Papacy and the Levant, p. 316, Sixtus IV spent between 1471-2 more than 144,000 gold florins on the papal fleet. Certain sums were paid directly to Carafa himself, as indicated, for example, in the entry, dated 4 May, 1472, of the Cameral accounts which records a payment to Carafa of 7,777 cameral florins, 25 bolognese pounds (the equivalent of 7,000 gold Venetian ducats), Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Intr. et. Ex., Reg. 487, fol. 171v: 'Exitus Maii MCCCCLXXII: dicta die [quarta] dominus thesaurus de mandato sibi die 30 Aprilis facto per manus depositariorum solvit reverendissimo domino Cardinali Neapolitano florenos similes septem millia septingentos septuaginta septem, bologninos XXV, in ducatis venetis auri VII m., in ducatis venetis auri VII m., in deductionem stipendiorum classis contra Turcum: fl.VIIc. LXXVII, 25'.

³³Diario concistoriale, p. 143: 'Die solemni Corporis Domini, circumlato sacramento a pontificia Vaticani ad Molem usque Adriani, atque inde Via Sacra ad basilicam Petri, in ea cardinalis Neapolitanus e familia Caraffa tituli Sancti Eusebii, legatus ante ad classem maritimam designatus, sacris est operatus, pontifice et patribus astantibus. Iis expletis, vexilla trirerum per orationes principum et potentatum, portata ad pontificem ad summum solium, in quo resederat, sunt; qui illis benedixit solemni ex caerimonialibus benedictione. Inde dicessum est ad horam eius diei vigesimam. Ipse pontifex comitatus partibus et praelatis, ad triremes profectus est, quae paulo infra coenobium beati Pauli, porta Ostiensi Pisis advectae, medio alveo Tiberis subsederunt. In praetorium ascendit pontifex et patrem nonnulli, ex cuius puppi loco edito, unde videri ab omnibus poterat, simili solemnite triremibus benedixit . . . legatum reliquit in classe, ipse ad Vaticanum reversus est. Erat nomen Oliverius, annos natus circiter quadraginta, summae modestiae et religionis, iuris canonici et civilis'. Stefano Infessura, Diario della città di Roma, ed. O. Tommasini (Rome, 1890), p. 76, also gives an short account of the day's events.

³⁴In A. de Tummulillis, Notabilia temporum, ed. C. Corvisieri, Fonti per la storia d'Italia (Livorno, 1890), p.188: 'dominus cardinalis

Carafa de Neapoli legatus a latere domini nostri pape contra Turchos cum pluribus navibus et galeis ipso die actinsit Neapolim et receptus fuit a rege et ab omnibus dominis magnatibus et Neapolitanis cum ingenti triumpho gaudio et honore'. There is an unpublished account of the entire expedition written and dedicated to Sixtus IV by Pietro Ursuleo who accompanied Carafa on the voyage, BAV, ottob. lat. 1938, 'Olivierii Cardinalis Neapolitani itinerarium classis apostolice in Turcos'. Marcantonio Sabellico, Rapsodie historiam Enneadum (Paris, 1513), Vol. II, fols. 320^v-321^r, also gives a brief account of the expedition. The definitive modern account is given by Setton, Papacy and the Levant, II, pp. 315-8, which supplements the older study of A. Guglielmotti, Storia della marina pontificia nel Medio Evo dal 728 al 1499 (Rome, 1886), Vol. II, pp. 342-72.

³⁵Guglielmotti, *ibid.*, p. 367, n.136, quotes an eye-witness account of this senseless destruction: 'itaque Urbs antiqua varia fortuna ac multis monumentis insignis, horarum spacio, in cineres collapsa est. Vidimus multa antiqua monumenta quadrati lapidis ac marmore magnifice aedificata, quorum nonnulla corruerunt, quaedam etiam extabant. Inter quae Homeri monumentum cum statua et inscriptione graecis literis'.

³⁶Infessura, Diario, p. 76. For a number of references to Carafa's ports of call in southern Italy on the return voyage, see M. Paone, 'Il Cardinale Oliviero Carafa e la terra d'Otranto', in Atti del Congresso sull'età Aragonese (Bari, 1968), pp. 613-19.

³⁷The portions of chain now hang on the wall of an upper corridor in Saint Peter's, approximately above the chapel of Pope Clement XIII. The original inscription is recorded in V. Forcella, Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma (Rome, 1875), Vol. VI, p. 40, no.70: 'SMYRNAM. UBI OLIVERIUS. CARD. NEAP. XYSTI. IV PONTIFICIAE CLASSIS. DUX. VI. OCCUPASSET IN SATALIAE. URBIS. ASIAE. PORTUM. VI. QUOQ. IRRUPUIT FERREAMQ. HANC. CATENAM. INDE. EXTRAXIT ET SPRA. VALVAS. HUIUS. BASILICAE SUSPENDIT'.

³⁸See P. de Angelis, L'architetto e gli affreschi di Santo Spirito in Saxia (Rome, 1961), pp. 258-260; E. D. Howe, The hospital of Santo Spirito and Pope Sixtus IV (New York, 1978), Pls. 38A, 39A, and esp. pp. 374-5, for transcriptions of the original inscription under this mural and the two successive versions of this inscription. A record of the original inscription occurs as an appendix to an anonymous life of Sixtus IV (BAV, cod. urb. lat. 1023, fols. 11^v-13^v).

³⁹Tummulillis, Notabilia, pp. 194-204, esp. 196, 202.

⁴⁰Pastor, History of the Popes, IV, pp. 289-90.

⁴¹Il diario romano di Jacopo Gherardi da Volterra dal 7 settembre 1479 al 12 agosto 1484, ed. E. Carusi, RIS, Vol. XXIII, 3 (Città di Castello, 1904), p. 49, entry for Friday, 20 April, 1481.

⁴²In the Cronaca di Napoli di Notar Giacomo, ed. P. Garzilli (Naples, 1845), pp. 130-1: 'A di XV de settembre dicti anni 1476. Ad ore XX. Essendo ordinato ala piazza della Incoronata uno catalfalcho reale per la

coronacione de dicta serenissima Signora dedomenica. Alaquale coronacione era venuto per legato lo Reverendissimo Monsignore Oliviero Carrafa Cardinale Neapolitano dove innanzi se erano facte piu feste giostre et imprese. Venne dal castello novo lo serenissimo Re Ferrando ad cavallo con la corona in testa et per la via si gictava moneta de argento et arrivo al catalfalcho dove sequio la messa el la coronacione de dicta regina et depo quella dicta per dicto cardinale. Sequio la collacione et poy le giostre et per piu di dapo dove la fiorentina nacione fe li secte triumphi del petrarcha et girandole'. Giuliano Passero in his Giornali, ed. V. M. Altobello (Naples, 1785), p. 31: 'Hoggi che ei Domenica, & sono li 5 [sic] di settembre 1476. Alle 20 hore s'ei incoronata regina d'Ungheria Madama Beatrice d'Aragona figlia de lo signore Re Ferrante D'Aragona, & havela incoronata lo Cardinale Oliviero Carrafa de Napoli, & re Ferrante venne de lo Castiello nuovo allo catalfalco con la corona reale in testa & jettaise in quisto juorno assai monete d'argento'. Beatrice left for Hungary on 28 September, 1476, accompanied by her brother, Francesco, who remained in Hungary with her for two years. This visit caused Carafa's uncle, Diomede, to compose two Memoriali, one addressed to Beatrice on the duties of a queen, and the other to Francesco on his conduct as a prince. See Petrucci, 'Diomede Carafa', pp. 527-8.

⁴³'Pro tua singulari virtute, animi magnitudine, summae sapientia, et constantia pro hac conficienda e conclundenda pace'. See Chiccarello, Antistitum, pp. 293-4, for the full text of this oration, which was first printed in 1557 in honour of Carafa's relative, Paul IV.

⁴⁴The point made by G. Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa "Annunciation": theology, artistic conventions and patronage', Art Bulletin, LXIII (1981), p. 70, and reiterated in Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel: Renaissance art in Rome (Kirkville, MO., 1986), pp. 31-2, that Carafa's title of Sabina was pertinent to his patronage of the Dominican Order is in fact based on a misconception. The suburbicarian diocese of Sabina had nothing to do with the Dominican church and priory of Santa Sabina in Rome. Santa Sabina was one of the earliest Dominican foundations in Rome and the titular church of the Cardinal Presbyter of Santa Sabina, but it was a title that Carafa never held. See, for example, Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, p. 97, where there is a specific reference to Carafa as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and Giovanni of Aragon as Cardinal Presbyter of Santa Sabina.

⁴⁵In two letters sent to Lorenzo de'Medici by the Florentine representative in Rome, Guidantonio Vespucci, dated 24 and 25 August, 1484, respectively, Archivio di Stato, Florence, Archivio avanti il Principato (henceforth MAP), XXXIX, nos. 295, 296, a number of references are made to Carafa's chances of election. Their contents also give a fair indication of the tortuous nature of such electoral campaigns.

⁴⁶Pastor, History of the Popes, V, pp. 232-9. Carafa's signature appears on the electoral capitulations listed by Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, p. 38.

⁴⁷Burchard, ibid., 1, p. 86, describes the order of Alfonso's procession thus: 'ab eo loco quo dux ab illis VI cardinalibus receptus fuit, equitavit ipse medius inter vicecancellarium et Neapolitanum, sequentibus aliis quatuor cardinalibus, binis et binis'. For the farewell procession, see ibid., 1, p. 87.

⁴⁸Il carteggio fra il cardinale Marco Barbo e Giovanni Lorenzi (1481-1490), ed. P. Paschini, Studi e testi, Vol. CXXXVII (Città del Vaticano, 1948), p. 132: 'ita, inquit dñominus Neapolitanus, diviso regno et capite alterius factionis dñomilno Federico, non timebunt barones servitiam et tyrannidem ducis Calabrie per aliquot tempus et in hoc fuisse prodicionem secretarii putat contra ducem, non ad expellendum regem'.

⁴⁹See below, chapter 6, pp. 353-4.

⁵⁰Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, pp. 125-7. Other evidence for Carafa acting in this capacity of executor to fellow cardinals and prelates can be found in the form of epitaphs on several tombs in Rome. See Forcella, Iscrizioni, I, no. 1259, III, no. 542, IV, no. 820.

⁵¹Zigarelli, Storia di Benevento, p. 102. The history and significance of Saint Januarius' relics will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 5.

⁵²Archivio Segreto Vaticano, arm. XXXV, Vol. 38 (Innoc. VIII vicaratus), published in L. Volpicella (ed.), Regis Ferdinandi I instructionem liber (10 maggio 1486-10 maggio 1488) (Naples, 1916), pp. 199-210.

⁵³In a letter, dated 1 December, 1488, written by Giovanni Lanfredini to Lorenzo de' Medici (MAP LVIII, no. 50), the Florentine representative refers to the enmity between the Cardinal of Naples and Ferrante.

⁵⁴Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 143.

⁵⁵Archivio di Stato, Florence, Riformagioni, Otta di Pratica, Carteggio, Responsive, no. 8, fol. 428: 'Car¹a di Napoli & di Lisbona hanno più voti che nessun altro'. The letter is published in full in Pastor, History of the Popes, V, pp. 535-6. For an account of the somewhat tortuous course of events, see ibid., V, pp. 378-84; G. B. Picotti, 'Nuovi studi e documenti intorno a papa Alessandro VI', Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, V (1951), pp. 185-207; and M. Mallett, The Borgias (London, 1967), pp. 107-110, who gives a more sympathetic interpretation of Rodrigo's conduct at the election.

⁵⁶Infessura, Diario, pp. 281-2.

⁵⁷F. Petrucci, 'Alessandro Carafa', DBI, XIX (1976), pp. 472-3, gives a clear account of Alessandro's term of office as Archbishop of Naples. He officiated at such major state ceremonies as the funeral of Ferrante on 25 January, 1494, and the coronation of Alfonso II on 8 May, 1494. In 1489 he and the cathedral chapter re-endorsed the synodal constitutions first promulgated in 1337 by Archbishop Giovanni Orsini.

See below, p. 73, for further discussion of Carafa's part in Alessandro's promotion.

^{5a}Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, pp. 463-4.

^{5b}Petrucchi, 'Oliviero Carafa', p. 591.

⁶⁰Pastor, History of the Popes, V, pp. 413, 423-6.

⁶¹Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, pp. 556-7.

⁶²Sigismondo de'Conti, Le storie de'suoi tempi, dal 1475 al 1510, trans. D. Zanelli and F. Calabro (Rome, 1883), Vol. II, p. 86.

⁶³Petrucchi, 'Oliviero Carafa', p. 591.

⁶⁴Philippe de Comines, Mémoires de Philippe de Commynes, ed. B. de Mandrot (Paris, 1903), Vol. II, p. 194. Notar Giacomo, Cronica, pp. 188-192; Passero, Giornali, pp. 70-2, also describe Charles VIII's sojourn in Naples between February and May of 1495. An account of the French king's attendance at the ceremony of the liquefaction of Saint Januarius' blood is given in R. Gaguin, La mer des croniques et miroir historial de France (Paris, 1525), Vol. IX, fol. 204^v. The origins and significance of this event will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 5, pp. 288-9.

⁶⁵Notar Giacomo, ibid., p. 209; Passero, ibid., pp. 107-8.

⁶⁶See below, chapter 5, pp. 287, 289-91.

⁶⁷Burchard, Liber notarum, 2, p. 15; Sigismondo de'Conti, Le storie, II, pp. 171-2.

⁶⁸Burchard, ibid., 2, p. 89; Notar Giacomo, Cronica, p. 221.

⁶⁹Burchard, ibid., 2, pp. 125, 174-6, 226. For a further discussion of the evidence that this tax supplies for Carafa's wealth see below, p. 71.

⁷⁰Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', pp. 136-7. The Venetian Senate's letter of 24 August, 1503, which warmly supports Carafa's prospective election as pope is published in Dispacci di Antonio Giustinian, ambasciatore veneto in Roma dal 1502 al 1505, ed. P. Villari (Florence, 1876), Vol. II, doc. IV, pp. 461-2.

⁷¹See ibid., II, pp. 126, 197, 205, for the missives dated 19 August, 15 and 23 September, 1503.

⁷²De Maio, Savonarola, pp. 136-7.

⁷³See the entry for June, 1509, in S. Tedallini, Diario della città di Roma, ed. P. Piccolomini (Città di Castello, 1904), RIS, Vol. XXIII, 3, 'Appendice', p. 318.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 318: 'lo papa remise allo cardinale de Napoli et allo cardinale de santo Giorgio'. Sigismondo de'Conti, Storie, II, p. 400, also acknowledges Carafa's part in these peace negotiations.

⁷⁵See Dispacci di Antonio Giustinian, index. For Giustiniani's dispatches of 5 November, 1504, where he reports that Carafa was determined to block Julius II's attempt to make nine new cardinals, and those of 23 July, 27 September, 1504, and 24 February, 1505, where he describes Carafa's part in engineering an alliance between Julius II and the Venetian Republic, see ibid., III, pp. 184, 242, 287, 433.

⁷⁶V. Ilardi, 'Crosses and carets: Renaissance patronage and coded letters of recommendation', American Historical Review, XC (1987), pp. 1127-1149, has raised quite properly the issue of deception in such letters of recommendation and the need to exercise a degree of caution in interpreting such letters as truthful statement of the affair in hand. I have not been able, however, to find any textual indication of Carafa employing secret codes or signs in any of these letters.

⁷⁷MAP XLVI, no. 562.

⁷⁸The Medici archive also contains fourteen letters written by Diomede between 2 January, 1471, and 16 February, 1485, all addressed to Lorenzo de' Medici.

⁷⁹MAP. XLVI, no. 556. Published by E. Müntz, Archivio storico dell'arte, II (1889), p. 984; A. Scharf, Filippino Lippi (Vienna, 1935), p. 89, doc. 9. The letter is transcribed from the original, with a number of corrections to the two earlier transcriptions, in Appendix II.

⁸⁰Archivio di Stato, Florence, Strozzi (hereafter Strozzi) V, 1249, 'Scritta della allogazione della cappelle di S. Maria Novella con Filippo di Filippo dipintore 1487', published by E. Borsook, 'Documents for Filippo Strozzi's chapel in Santa Maria Novella', Burlington Magazine, CXII (1970), p. 803; J. Russell Sale, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel in Santa Maria Novella (New York, 1979), Appendix A, doc. 8.

⁸¹Published by Z. Bicchieri, Alcuni documenti artistici non mai stampati (1454-1565) (Florence, 1855); Scharf, Filippino Lippi, pp. 90-1, Doc. 11. Both authors cite a reference to the Biblioteca Marucelliana, Codice segnato nel dorso di no. 65. A search in that library for this document has yielded no result.

⁸²Filippo Strozzi was instrumental in sending valuable artefacts to Diomede Carafa, as recorded in the 'Libro ricordanze di Filippo e Lorenzo Strozzi: cambi commissioni, date e ricevute, ricordi e conti' (Strozzi, V, no. 22, fol. 95^r), published by Sale, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel, p. 515. Between 1 August, 1487, and at least 1 August, 1488, he was also in Naples looking after his banking interests. See Borsook, 'Documents', p. 741. For a general account of Strozzi's contacts with Naples, see Sale, ibid., pp. 9-17.

⁸³Strozzi, V, 19, fol. 60^v.

⁸⁴See below, pp. 60-1. For an account of Giovanni's early titles and his promotion to the cardinaliture, see G. B. Picotti, La giovinezza di Leone X (Milan, 1925), pp. 67-159, and the older but still useful study, W. Roscoe, Life and pontificate of Leo X (London, 1846), Vol. I, pp. 8-14.

⁸⁵MAP LVIII, nos. 37, 50, 56, 58, 59-62. See also Picotti, *ibid.*, pp. 191-2.

⁸⁶MAP LI, no. 451, is a rough draft, dated 14 February, 1489 (1488, old style), of this circular letter. MAP LVIII, no. 64, is a clean but undated copy of the same circular letter with its contents substantially the same apart from a number of minor emendations.

⁸⁷Picotti, La giovinezza, pp. 195-200.

⁸⁸This construction of events has been arrived at independently by D. Friedman, 'The burial chamber of Filippo Strozzi in Santa Maria Novella', L'Arte, IX (1970), pp. 108-131, esp. pp. 118-122; Sale, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel, pp. 114-6, and Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 45, similarly see Strozzi's close contacts with both Lorenzo and Carafa as instrumental in Carafa obtaining Filippino Lippi's services.

⁸⁹MAP XLI, no. 427.

⁹⁰For a general account of the process by which such an ascendancy was achieved, see W.A. Hinnebusch, The history of the Dominican Order (2 vols., New York, 1966-73), Vol. II, pp. 19, 23-7, 37-44.

⁹¹Cretyens, 'Le "Studium Romanae Curiae"', pp. 69-82; O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 17-20.

⁹²D. A. Mortier in his history of the Dominican Master Generals, Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'Ordre des frères prêcheurs (8 vols., Paris, 1903-20), Vols. IV and V, refers in some detail to the role of the Cardinal Protector and Carafa's intervention in the affairs of the Order. S. L. Forte, The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order (Rome, 1959), Dissertationes historicae, Vol. XV, pp. 24-9, provides the definitive account of Carafa as Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order, supported by excellent archival references.

⁹³Forte, *ibid.*, p. 24. Carafa had had some involvement with the Dominicans before his appointment as Cardinal Protector. See above, note 29 and two documentary references, dated respectively 1 July, 1474, and 21 April, 1475, in the Archivio Generale O.P., Santa Sabina, Rome (hereafter AGOP), Prov. Regni, IV, 3, fols 72, 77, to Carafa passing judgement on a dispute in the province of Naples.

⁹⁴Mortier, Histoire des maîtres généraux, IV, pp. 570, 589-92. Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, p. 85.

⁹⁵AGOP Reg. Torr. 9, fol. 77^v, fol. 86^v. Mortier, *ibid.*, IV, pp. 600-3, 624; V, pp. 1, 7.

⁹⁶For Ludovico da Ferrara, see T. Kaeppli, Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi (Rome, 1980), Vol. III, pp. 92-3; J. O'Malley, 'The feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas in Renaissance Rome: a neglected document and its import', Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, XXXV (1981), pp. 12-13. Ludovico's scholarship and Carafa's patronage of it is discussed in further detail below, chapter 3, pp. 113-4.

⁹⁷Burchard, Liber notarum, 2, p. 285. For an account of the General Chapter of May, 1501, see Mortier, Histoire des maîtres généraux, V, pp. 71-4. For Vincenzo Bandello, see ibid., V, pp. 67-127. The anecdote that Leonardo painted Bandello's features as Judas as a form of revenge for the prior's insistence on the completion of the mural, has been completely discredited. For an indication of Bandello's orthodox Thomist position, see P. O. Kristeller, 'A Thomist critique of Marsilio Ficino's theory of will and intellect', in Henry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee volume (Jerusalem, 1965), pp. 463-94, esp. pp. 472-3. For Carafa's promotion of Cajetan, see Mortier, ibid., V, pp. 144-6. For Cajetan, see P. Madonnet, 'Cajétan', in the Dictionnaire de théologie catholique (Paris, 1905), II, cols. 1313-1329, and for more recent studies, see O'Malley, Praise and blame, p. 108, n. 123. Cajetan's scholarship and Carafa's patronage of it is discussed in further detail below, chapter 3, pp. 107-8.

⁹⁸Mortier, ibid., V, pp. 145-6: 'le Cardinal mit tout en oeuvre pour faire élire son protégé'. The papal dispensation, dated 1 June, 1508, for the holding of this particular General Chapter, survives in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Arm. 39, vol. 28, fols. 300^v-301^r, and is published by Forte, The Cardinal-Protector, Appendix II, doc. 6, p. 68.

⁹⁹Mortier, ibid., V, pp. 51-2; D. Weinstein, Savonarola and Florence: prophecy and patriotism in the Renaissance (Princeton, 1970), pp. 107-8.

¹⁰⁰MAP XLV, no. 569, published by De Maio, Savonarola, Appendix II, p. 181.

¹⁰¹See above, pp. 39-40.

¹⁰²The clearest accounts of Savonarola's dealings with Carafa occur in De Maio, Savonarola, passim, and in the older, but still valuable, study, P. Villari, La storia di Girolamo Savonarola e de'suoi tempi (2 vols., Florence, 1887-8), passim. Villari, ibid., I, docs. XI, 2; XII; XIV, 2; II, doc. XXXIII, usefully publishes two letters addressed to Carafa, one (dated 10 May, 1493) from the Dieci di Balìa, the other (undated) from the Signoria which both urge Carafa to effect the independance of San Marco; the letter (undated) from the Signoria which offer their thanks to him for having achieved this objective; and the two papal bulls of 22 May, 1493, and 7 November, 1496.

¹⁰³An example of Carafa's measures in this direction can be gleaned from such documents as AGOP, IV, 9, fol. 97^r, 11, fol. 68^r, and the one cited in Bullarium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, eds. T. Ripoll and A. Brémond (8 vols., Rome, 1729-40) Vol. IV, p. 239, Vol. VII, p. 114.

¹⁰⁴'Cuius dominatio reverendissima ordinis protectionem iam annis XXX et ultra sanctissime peregit et multa bona ordini fecit. Cuius dominationi totus ordo tanquam singularissimo patri et benefactori benemerito tenetur et obligatur'. The full text is published by R. Creytens, 'Les écrivains dominicains dans la chronique d'Albert de Castello, 1516', AFP, XXX (1960), p. 297.

¹⁰⁵Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis Praedicatorum, compiled by B. M. Reichert in, Monumenta ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum historica (Rome, 1900-1), Vol. VIII: p. 372 (for 1481); p. 389 (for 1484); A. M. Amato, 'Gli atti dei capitoli generali del 1474 e del 1486 e altri frammenti, 1489-1501', AFP, XVII (1947), p. 246 (for 1486); Acta capitulorum, VIII, p. 415 (for 1491); p. 421 (for 1494); p. 436 (for 1498); IX, p. 23 (for 1501); G. Löhr, 'Die akten der provinzial-kapitel der Teutonia von 1503 und 1520', AFP, XVII (1947), p. 269 (for 1503); Acta capitulorum, IX, p. 56 (for 1505); p. 80 (for 1507); p. 91 (for 1508); p. 122 (for 1513).

¹⁰⁶E. Baccetti, 'Vallombrosans', New Catholic Encyclopedia, XIV, p. 526; D. Meade, The constitutional development of the monastic Congregation of Vallombrosans from 1035 to 1484 (Rome, 1960), *passim*; R. N. Vasaturo et. al., Vallombrosa nel IX centenario della morte fondatore Giovanni Gualberto (exhib. cat., Florence, 1973), *passim*.

¹⁰⁷Vasaturo, *ibid.*, pp. 114, 116-7; De Maio, Savonarola, pp. 80-2. For Biagio Milanese, see T. Sala, Dizionario storico biografico di scrittori, letterati ed artisti dell'Ordine di Vallombrosa (2 Vols., Florence, 1929-1937), Vol. II, pp. 62-5.

¹⁰⁸Vasaturo, *ibid.*, pp. 120, 121; Picotti, La giovinezza, pp. 86-92.

¹⁰⁹MAP LXVI, no. 198.

¹¹⁰MAP XLVI, no. 556, see also Appendix II for a transcription of this letter. Abbot Milanese's efforts to obtain Medici support are recorded in a contemporary chronicle, 'Delle azioni di Don Biagio Milanese', fols. 7, 8, 131-2, 218-9 (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS Magl. XXXVII, 325).

¹¹¹MAP XLVI, no. 572, published in De Maio, Savonarola, Appendix II, p. 182.

¹¹²Hay, Church in Italy, pp. 77-8.

¹¹³See below, chapter 6, note 1.

¹¹⁴See N. Widloecher, La congregazione dei Canonici Regolari Lateranensi (Gubbio, 1929) pp. 278-9. For Cardinal Arcimboldi, see N. Raponi, 'Giovanni Arcimboldi', DBI (Rome, 1961), Vol. III, pp. 771-3.

¹¹⁵In the case of the Dominicans, for example, Carafa tried to insure the election of the Master General from the Observant wing of the Order.

For his foundation of a reform Congregation in France, see Mortier, Histoire des maîtres généraux, V, pp. 15-16.

¹¹⁶Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 303-4.

¹¹⁷See above, note 112.

¹¹⁸De Maio, 'Savonarola, Oliviero Carafa, Tommaso de Vio e la Disputa di Raffaello', AFP, XXXVIII (1968), pp. 149-164; 'Teologia e riformatori nella "Disputa" di Raffaello', in Riforme e miti nella Chiesa del Cinquecento (Naples, 1973), pp. 65-80, has offered another piece of evidence for Carafa's reputation as a reformer. He identifies amongst the churchmen grouped around the altar in Raphael's fresco of the Disputa in the Stanza della Segnatura portraits of Savonarola, Carafa and his protégés, Cajetan and Gian Pietro Carafa (later Paul IV). In De Maio's view these figures personify three sorts of Catholic reform: Carafa and Cajetan, traditional orthodoxy and Christian humanism; Gian Pietro, the intransigent Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation; Savonarola, the theology of the mystic. Such an interpretation is problematic. Portraits could hardly be introduced into a painting in order to personify their subsequent reputations. A close examination of the painted figures in question, as compared to bona fide portraits of these four persons, has left me unconvinced that these are, in fact, portraits at all.

¹¹⁹'Constitutiones synodales diocesis Sabinensis pro reformatione cleri'. A papal bull of 18 September, 1495, transferred the clergy's place of residence and exercise of their pastoral duties from the episcopal seat of Sabina to Magliana. See De Maio, Savonarola, pp. 138-9, n. 24.

¹²⁰BAV, Vat. lat. 3883, 'Propositiones et avisamenta pro reformatione'; Vat. lat. 3884, 'Reformationes' (dated c. 1511). The unpromulgated reform bull of Sixtus IV, 'Quoniam regnantum', occurs in Vat. lat. 3883, fols. 14^r-25^v, Vat. lat. 3884, fols. 118^r-132^v, and that of Alexander VI, 'In apostolicae sedis specula', in Vat. lat. 3884, fols. 73^r-109^v. (Two other copies of the latter bull exist in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Arm. XI. 88, fols. 1^v-2^v, 41^r-82^v.) Several extracts from Vat lat. 3883 and 3884 are published by L. Celier, 'Alexandre VI e la réforme de l'église, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, XXVII (1907), pp. 65-124. For a useful summary of the reform bulls and plans issued by various popes in the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, see D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 216-7, and for curial humanists' concern with reform and the limited application of their proposals, see ibid., pp. 212-26, 236-7.

¹²¹Vat. lat. 3884, fol. 110^r.

¹²²See below, chapter 3, pp. 102-4.

¹²³Hallman, Italian cardinals, p. 16.

¹²⁴Ibid., pp. 35-7, 78-9, 124-5.

¹²⁵'Testamento', fol. [4v]. See also above, note 14.

¹²⁶For these family relationships, see Table I. Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 147, is inaccurate in stating that Carafa designated Alessandro, Archbishop of Naples, as one of his heirs, since Alessandro died in 1503. Carafa is referring here to his nephew, Vincenzo, who became Archbishop of Naples in 1505.

¹²⁷See C. Eubel, Hierarchia catholica Medii Aevi (Regensburg, 1910), pp. 3, 5, 9. For Niccolò Fieschi as Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans, see Forte, The Cardinal Protector, p. 29.

¹²⁸For Cajetan, see above, pp. 54-5, and below, chapter 3, pp. 107-8. The Swabian, Nicolaus Splenger a Schömberg was Cajetan's successor as Procurator General (see O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 110-1), and later Archbishop of Capua (1520) and cardinal (1535). Benedetto da Foiano died in Castel Sant'Angelo as a result of his so-called Lutheran sympathies but more probably because of his opposition to the restoration of the Medici family in Florence. See Mortier, Histoire des maîtres généraux, V, p. 154; Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 152; De Maio, Savonarola, p. 164. For Giovanni Battista Almadiano, see below, chapter 3, p. 124.

¹²⁹The will of Cardinal Rinaldo Brancacci is published and discussed in R. W. Lightbown, Donatello and Michelozzo: an artistic partnership and its patrons in the early Renaissance (2 vols., London, 1980), I, pp. 75-80, II, pp. 293-297. For discussion of several sixteenth-century cardinals' wills, see Hallman, Italian cardinals, pp. 80-94. For the organisation and governance of cardinals' households, see Partner, Renaissance Rome, pp. 134-5, D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 39-40, 45-56.

¹³⁰See G. Gualdo, 'Marco Barbo', DBI (1964), Vol. VI, pp. 249-52, esp. p. 251.

¹³¹For the best surveys to date of Renaissance cardinals' degrees of wealth and sources of income, see Chambers, 'Economic predicament', passim; Antonovics, 'Counter Reformation cardinals', p. 325; ibid., 'A late fifteenth-century division register', passim; Hallman, Italian cardinals, passim.

¹³²Chambers, ibid., pp. 298, 300; Hallman, ibid., p. 16.

¹³³For a comprehensive analysis of Renaissance cardinals' assiduous farming of the Church's wealth, see Hallman, ibid., esp. pp. 46-63. According to H. O. Evennett, The spirit of the Counter-Reformation, ed. J. Bossy (Cambridge, 1968) p. 108, the cardinals as a body stood par excellence for the system of accumulation and exploitation of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical benefices, especially non-Italian benefices, for financial profit.

¹³⁴M. Sanuto, I diarii, ed. R. Fulin (Venice, 1884), Vol. XI, col. 771: 'esser letere di Roma, di 20, di la morte dil reverendissimo cardinal di napolì, primo episcopo e lume exemplar di cardinalato, di

natione neapolitano, di gente Caraffa, havia intrada ducati 12 milia et anni'.

¹³⁵Burchard, Liber notarum, 2, p. 226. According to this list Carafa was by no means the wealthiest. Ascanio Sforza commanded 30,000 ducats and Giuliano della Rovere, 20,000. For an analysis of this declaration by the cardinals of their annual income, see J. Delumeau, Vie économique et sociale de Rome dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle (2 vols., Paris, 1957-59), Vol. I, pp. 451-2.

¹³⁶Chambers, 'Economic predicament', p. 294.

¹³⁷Antonovics, 'Counter-Reformation cardinals', p. 325.

¹³⁸These items of expenditure will be discussed in greater detail below, chapter 3, pp. 101-111, chapter 6, pp. 353-9.

¹³⁹Passero, Giornali, pp. 117-8.

¹⁴⁰G. Vasari, Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori, ed. G. Milanesi (Florence, 1878), Vol. III, pp. 470-1 (hereafter Vasari-Milanesi): 'duemila ducati d'oro, senza le spese degli azzurri e de'garzoni'.

¹⁴¹H. Lerner-Lehmkuhl, Zur Struktur und Geschichte des Florentinischen Kunstmarktes im 15. Jahrhundert (Wattenscheid, 1936), pp. 34-5; Borsook, 'Documenti', p. 738, n. 20.

¹⁴²'Testamento', fol. [3v]: 'Et quia mea intencio semper fuit disponere de multis rebus meis mobilibus iam feci donavi et disposui, ideo circa in onibus [sic] et singulis aliis meis bonis mobilibus et immobilibus Romane et ubique consistentibus ad que mea prefata facultas a sede apostolica se extendit solutis'.

¹⁴³Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 153, n. 41. Sixtus IV, in the bull, 'Etsi universi Romanae Ecclesiae dominio temporali', dated 1 January, 1474, gave permission to clerics and laymen who died in Rome to will their real property to their families.

¹⁴⁴Hallman, Italian cardinals, pp. 81-2.

¹⁴⁵Notar Giacomo, Cronica, pp. 259, 311-2, reports that the news of Alessandro's death in Rome reached Naples on 5 August, 1503, that on the following Sunday the bells in all the city's churches and monasteries were rung, and that his funeral was held on 31 October, 1508. Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 314, quotes the letter of 1 August, 1503, where Carafa notifies the cathedral canons of their archbishop's death and his intention to take the title again.

¹⁴⁶For accounts of Bernardino and Vincenzo as Archbishop of Naples, see Chioccarello, ibid., pp. 314-320.

¹⁴⁷For a general account of this practice, see Hay, The church in Italy, pp. 12-19, 74-5. D. Ambrasi, 'La vita religiosa nella Napoli

Angioana, Storia di Napoli (Naples, 1969), Vol. III, pp. 549-560, gives a graphic account of the Carafa family's monopoly of the archiepiscopal title during the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

¹⁴⁸The date given for Gian Pietro's entry into the household of his cardinal relative in the standard biographical sources is 1494. Carafa obtained on behalf of his well-educated and pious protégé the post of papal chamberlain at the court of Alexander VI and, in 1506, the bishopric of Chieti. For Gian Pietro Carafa's early career and association with religious reform and the Theatines, see Pastor, History of the Popes (4th ed., 1938) X, pp. 401-423; (3rd ed., 1950), XI, pp. 147, 154-5, 157, 161, 169; P. Paschini, S. Gaetano Thiene, Gian Pietro Carafa e le origini dei chierici regolari teatine, *passim*.

¹⁴⁹Douglas, Jacopo Sadoletto, pp. 10, 245. For further discussion of Carafa's patronage of Sadoletto, see below, chapter 3, pp. 121-3.

¹⁵⁰Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 159, n.58.

¹⁵¹Julius II to Cardinal Leonardo Grasso della Rovere (governor of Rome in the Pope's absence), in a letter dated 24 January, 1511, published in Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 308.

¹⁵²Sadoletus, 'Oratio in funere', fol. 408r: 'Fortunas suas ita dispensavit, ut familiam quidem molliter tranquilliterque haberet: in caetero victu frugalitatis privatim amantior'. Cortesius, 'De familia cardinalis', De cardinalitu, Liber II, cap. 3, fol. 56v, confirms this assessment of Carafa's governance of his household.

¹⁵³Marco Girolamo Vida, Epicedion in funere Reverendi domini domini Oliverii Caraphae: Romae in sacris aedibus Pacis nostrae (Rome, 1511), fol. 1r: 'cuius semper vita innocens fuit et religioni addicta'. The edition used is the Vatican Library copy (Barberini GGGVII 62, int. 11).

¹⁵⁴Le due spedizioni militari di Giulio II tratte dal diario di Paride de Grassi Bolognese, ed. L. Frati (Bologna, 1886), pp. 230-1: 'Die 20 Ianuarij mortuus est in Urbe bonae memoriae D. Oliverius Caraffa Episcopus Ostiensis, et Cardinalis Neapolitanus, quemadmodum nunciatum est hic Bononiae die 22^a; cuius anima in pace quiescat. Fuit homo consummatissimus in omnibus virtutibus sic, ut caelestis vitae haberetur, gravissimus in consilijs, maturus in colloquio, et aetate decrepita moriens, nunquam correctus quod peccaverit cum aliquo, optimus ecclesiasticus, et timens Deum, ad cuius honorem plurima templa in locis extruxit'. It is interesting that Paris de Grassis ends his obituary with a reference to Carafa as a patron of ecclesiastical architecture.

¹⁵⁵Sigismondo de'Conti, Le storie, I, p. 6; II, pp. 86, 171-2.

¹⁵⁶Cortesius, De cardinalitu, Liber I, cap. 8, fol. 43r; Liber II, cap. 2, fol. 54r, cap. 10, fol. 126r, Liber III, cap. 15, fol. 236v. For other specific references to Carafa made by Cortese, see *ibid.*, Liber I, cap. 2, fol. 14r; Liber II, cap. 3, fol. 56v, cap. 4, fol. 61v. For an excellent summary of Cortese's treatise and its moral intent, see D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 226-236.

¹⁵⁷For a discussion of Diomedes as a patron and exemplar to his nephew, see below, chapter 7, pp. 382-5.

¹⁵⁸See, for example, Carafa's criticism of Burchard's decision to cense the altar before the celebrant's recitation of the Magnificat at vespers on Holy Saturday, 25 March, 1486 (Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, p.145), and his indignation at Burchard for deciding to omit a sermon composed by a Carmelite brother and intended for the papal chapel on the fourth Sunday in Advent, 1502 (ibid., 2, pp. 340-1). On this latter occasion, Burchard recalls Carafa as: 'nominans me presumptuosum, temerarium et insolentem'.

CHAPTER III

Carafa and Renaissance humanism

Carafa's erudition was frequently noted by his contemporaries.' On the basis of these compliments paid to him by scholars of the standing of Antonio Beccadelli (known as Il Panormita), Andrea Brenta and Jacopo Sadoletto, Ann Reynolds has recently argued that Carafa had 'a considerable status as a man of learning, a status most properly defined as that of a humanist'.² The following account of Carafa's scholarly aptitudes and patronage of learning seeks to explore this claim.

'Humanist' and its closely associated term 'humanism' have been the object of much discussion and re-formulation. It has been rightly stressed that Renaissance humanism and its practitioners should not be confused with 'humanitarianism' or humanism in its modern sense of a rational, secular approach to life. Nevertheless humanism still gives rise to a variety of differing interpretations. It is proposed here, therefore, to adopt a very narrow definition for 'humanist' and 'humanism' but one that was recognised during the Renaissance.

Renaissance humanists were those who practised the studia humanitatis - in other words they studied Latin (and to a lesser extent, Greek) texts which dealt with grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry and moral philosophy. Their own literary production embraced a similar range of subjects - poetry, history, philology, textual criticism and some branches of philosophy. Above all they were interested in the revival of classical rhetoric.³

As indicated in the previous chapter, Carafa had received an university education, but one directed towards acquiring expertise in the practice of canon and civil law rather than the studia humanitatis. At least two members of his household made, however, more extensive claims for Carafa's learning in other fields. Sadoletto refers in his funeral oration to the cardinal's expertise in letters, philosophy and theology.⁴ Likewise Carafa's one-time secretary, Andrea Brenta, in his letter prefacing his translation of the Oratio funebris Lysiae also pays tribute to Carafa's extensive education:

. . . diligentia & parentum studio a puero iis artibus educatus & institutus fuisti; quibus ingenuos pueros in quibus aliquod pudoris & ingenii signum in est: erudiri & institui decor. Ubi vero plerumque laetatem sapere coepisti: & intellegere qualem virtutis vires essent: te totum litterarum studiis tradidisti. Qualem cum degustasses: eorum dulcedine oblectatus & doctrinae cupiditate inflammatus: relictis nobilibus & laetis patriae tuis deliciis: ad extremam italicam partes: ut viros doctos & sapientes audires: te contulisti.⁵

Despite these epithets, what survive of Carafa's own literary efforts are primarily letters relating to practical, administrative and judicial matters arising from his position as a high-ranking ecclesiastic. These letters indicate that he (or his secretary at his direction), was capable of writing in a fluent style in Latin, Italian or Spanish. By way of contrast, an unpublished oration addressed to Ferrante, King of

Naples, provides a rare example of Carafa composing a humanist text.

(See Appendix III, for a transcription of this piece.)

From the expressions of sorrow at the premature demise of Ferrante and gratitude towards the new king (Alfonso II), it would appear that Carafa penned this oration shortly after Ferrante's death in 1494. In terms of its style, it has the characteristics of the epideictic oration, a revived genre of classical oratory, which, as John McManamon and John O'Malley have shown,⁶ was a literary form greatly favoured by the humanists of the papal court. Carafa's familiarity with this genre and his patronage of scholars working within this tradition will be discussed in further detail below.⁷ Suffice it to say here that, like the epideictic oration, Carafa's oration is an exercise in praise. While alluding to the deceased king and his virtues, it is not, however, a straightforward funerary oration since its primary goal is to express the author's gratitude towards his new royal patron. It is also relatively short and therefore does not display the compositional organisation of a fully-formulated epideictic oration, as does, for example, Carafa's own funeral oration by Sadoletto, or those composed in memory of various Renaissance popes.⁸

It begins with a conventional expression of regret at the untimely death of the king and then lists his deeds, virtues and achievements - the classic res gestae of a panegyric of this kind. Matched with this list of virtues is a longer description of the new king's qualities as a wise and equable ruler. As is typical of the genre, Alfonso II's greater abilities are further emphasised by an allusion to classical prototypes

- the superiority of Ajax to his father, Telemon, and Achilles to his father, Peleus. The oration ends with an emotive peroration (again a standard device of the epideictic oration), with the author expressing his undying loyalty to the new king, as benefactor to both himself and his family.

Apart from his university education and this one isolated instance of a humanist set piece, Carafa also involved himself with a number of other manifestations of Renaissance scholarship. The remainder of this chapter will therefore seek to discuss in turn each of these different sorts of intellectual activity.

The library

Like a number of his contemporaries in the Sacred College, Carafa collected a library of books.⁹ From the bequest made in his will to Santa Maria della Pace, it appears that his library comprised books in theology, philosophy, canon and civil law.¹⁰ The library was presumed lost until 1959, when Mgr Leonard Boyle O.P. identified a number of Santa Maria della Pace's books in the library of San Clemente in Rome. His subsequent research on the history of the Irish Dominicans in Rome enabled him to trace the fortunes of these volumes.¹² In 1808, the Canons Regular at Santa Maria della Pace were so depleted in numbers that they were forced to abandon the church and convent. In 1817, a papal bull enabled the Irish Dominicans in Rome to take possession of Santa Maria della Pace. They did not remain there for long, however, and in 1825 returned to their original house at San Clemente, taking

with them the richly endowed library of Santa Maria della Pace. At its centre lay Carafa's donation of manuscripts and early printed editions.¹³ This precious collection remained under the care of the Irish Dominicans at San Clemente until autumn 1985, when the entire collection, apart from an early Dominican lectionary, was stolen from the library. Its present location is unknown.

Of the fifteen manuscripts once housed at San Clemente, two were definitely presentation copies made for Oliviero Carafa. The first of these manuscripts (Pls. 2, 3), contains the complete commentaries on the fifth book of the decretals by the jurist, Antonio de Butrio (1338-1408). The second manuscript (Pls. 4,5), gives selected commentaries on the third, fourth and fifth books of the Sext by Antonio's pupil, Domenico di San Gimignano (d. 1436). On the final page of the commentaries on the Decretals, Hermann of Münster states that he had copied the manuscript for Oliviero, Archbishop of Naples (Pl. 3).¹⁴ The Carafa coat of arms duly appears at the foot of the opening page (Pl. 2). Significantly, the cardinal's hat does not appear over this armorial device and thus confirms the title given to Carafa in the explicit and dates the production of this manuscript to between 1464 and 1467. Although the explicit of the commentaries on the Sext makes no reference to Carafa but merely gives the name of the scribe as Peter Schell of Cologne (Pl. 5), the manuscript must also have been copied at that time since an identical coat of arms appears on the lower border of the opening page (Pl. 4).

As a student of canon law, Carafa would have familiarised himself with the text of the Decretals and the Sext and the various commentaries made on them by such authorities as Antonio de Butrio and Domenico di San Gimignano. He may well have received instruction on these authors' interpretations from another celebrated jurist, Alessandro Tartagna, who wrote on the judgements of de Butrio.¹⁵ While it was accepted practice that a high-ranking ecclesiastic, like the Archbishop of Naples, would commission well-written and finely decorated manuscripts, the contents of these two manuscripts would have been of particular relevance to Carafa. At the time of their production, he was involved in the settlement of legal disputes in the archiepiscopal court in Naples and therefore relied on just such scholarly interpretations of canon law as those supplied by Antonio de Butrio and Domenico di San Gimignano.

In this group of manuscripts from Santa Maria della Pace are four others which deal with matters of canon law. Two of these form a pair and contain the commentaries made by Cardinal Juan Torquemada (1388-1468) on the Decretum of Gratian. The explicit in both volumes states clearly that the French cardinal, Philibert Hugonet, had them copied in 1475 and 1476 respectively by a fellow countryman, Stephanus de Ponte of Aix-le-Chapelle.¹⁶ Hugonet's coat of arms appears on the lower border of the opening page of each manuscript. As I have argued in detail elsewhere,¹⁷ the personal connections between Cardinal Carafa and Hugonet are not well documented but Carafa's regard for the author, Cardinal Torquemada, is better authenticated. Torquemada was one of Carafa's most illustrious predecessors as Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order and both men shared a common interest in the

embellishment of the church and convent of the Dominican house of Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome. Given Carafa's interest in canon law and his apparent admiration for the author, it can safely be assumed that these Torquemada manuscripts came into Carafa's possession after Hugonet's death in 1485.

Another manuscript, containing a copy of Niccolò de Collicorvino's commentary on the Decretum, can likewise be identified as a presentation copy for another of Carafa's fellow cardinals, Cardinal Marco Barbo. In this instance, Carafa's personal association with the original owner is well substantiated. Moreover, since Carafa acted as Cardinal Barbo's executor, it is highly probable that Carafa acquired this volume from Cardinal Barbo's richly endowed library after Barbo's death in 1491.¹³

The sixth book in this group of manuscripts on canon law is another standard text on this subject - Albericus de Rosate's Repertorium iuris canonici. Although it carries no signs of its original owner, it would be an appropriate acquisition for the library of a high-ranking ecclesiastic like Carafa.

A second group of four manuscripts, which also probably came from Carafa's personal collection of books, is very different from those previously discussed. These are much smaller in format and more utilitarian in terms of manufacture and content. Each manuscript contains a varied collection of legal texts written by fourteenth-century jurists on matters pertaining to the practice of canon and civil law.¹⁴

Amongst the books that once belonged to the library of Santa Maria della Pace and by inference to Cardinal Carafa, one stands out as different in subject from the other predominantly legal works. It contains the Divinae Institutiones written in the early decades of the fourth century by Firmianus Lactantius. This particular transcription had been executed by Thomas Cantacuzene of Constantinople and completed on 13th February, 1466, at Otranto in southern Italy. The scribe may have been a member of one of the minor branches of the royal family of Greece who, after the fall of Constantinople, had taken refuge in South Italy.²⁰

The Divinae Institutiones is of especial interest to the student of Carafa's patronage, since, in this work, Lactantius refers to the ten sibyls listed by Varro in his lost Antiquitates rerum divinarum; he also intersperses his text with passages from the sibylline prophecies and remarks on their concordance with those of the Old Testament prophets. As will be seen in chapter four, one of the most remarkable features of the painted decoration in Carafa's chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva is the inclusion of representations of the Delphic, Cumaean, Hellespontine and Tiburtine sibyls in the chapel vault. It had hitherto been more common to place figures either of the four Evangelists or Doctors of the Church in such a location. Each sibyl carries a scroll with an abbreviated version of a prophecy attributed to her. The prophecy belonging to the Tiburtine sibyl is that given to her by Lactantius. The source, however, for all four inscriptions is a work of Dominican scholarship, the Discordantiae Sanctorum Hieronymi et Augustini published in Rome in 1481.²¹ In this treatise, the author, Filippo Barbieri, sets out a persuasive argument for Saint Augustine's

endorsement of the sibyls' prophecies of Christ's advent.

Significantly, in this first printed edition Oliviero Carafa's name appears amongst the dedicatees.²³ Carafa's familiarity with this Dominican treatise and its influence on the programme of his painted chapel scheme will be discussed in further detail in chapter four. It should be noted at this point, however, that Carafa may well have once owned a patristic work testifying to the truthful, divinely-inspired foreknowledge of the sibyls, and that he had it copied in 1466, some fifteen to twenty years before the publication of Barbieri's treatise and the initiation of the Minerva chapel scheme.

Apart from the Lactantius, the manuscripts owned by Carafa do not accord with the description given in his will of books on theology and philosophy. It is in the printed editions that once belonged to Santa Maria della Pace that such subjects can be found. Of these, the three volumes that most assuredly belonged to Carafa's library are those which contain the work of the Dominican theologian and Thomist scholar, Cajetan.

The binding and decoration of Cajetan's commentary on Aristotle's De anima indicate that this particular volume was a presentation copy given by Cajetan, the current Master General of the Dominican Order, to Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and Protector of that Order (Pls. 6, 7). A second volume of Cajetan's writings also has the hallmarks of a presentation copy (Pl. 8). This hand-decorated edition of Cajetan's commentaries on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics and Praedicamenta, and Porphyry's Isagoge, is dedicated to Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Sabina

and Protector of the Dominican Order. The third volume contains a collection of Cajetan's philosophical works, including once again his comments on the Posterior Analytics and one of his earliest works on Saint Thomas Aquinas' De ente et essentia. A second book contains works by Aquinas with the saint's commentaries on the Peri Hermeneias and the Posterior Analytics of Aristotle. The dedication to Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, and the remnants of a marginal note denoting the volume as the property of Santa Maria della Pace, argue for Carafa's one-time ownership.

In his dedication to the 1509 publication of Aristotle's De anima, Cajetan gives a spirited acknowledgement of the debt that he owes to his high-minded and studious patron: 'vel quia nihil ad me proficiscens non potest deberi, tibi tuumque esse. Qui me paterna semper charitate magnisque beneficiis prosequutus . . . ei viro qui corporis voluptatibus abdicatis animam pietate multa et sapientiae studio semper excoluit'.²⁴

In the dedication to the commentary on the Posterior Analytics he outlines the reasons why this was the case. He had met Carafa when he was a youth, spent time in Carafa's household where he received favours and protection; after a period of study abroad, Carafa summoned him back in order that they should enjoy one another's company and discourse on a daily basis. He pays further tribute to the cardinal's wise council in the practicalities of life.²⁵

Thus Cajetan testifies that his fortunes were tied closely to Cardinal Carafa. The facts of Cajetan's biography bear this out.²⁶ Like Carafa, Cajetan came from South Italy. Born in Gaeta in 1468, he entered the

Dominican Order in 1484. After studying philosophy in Naples and theology in Bologna, he lectured at the universities of Padua, Pavia and Milan. In 1500 he was summoned to Rome at the request of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. As the leading theologian at the pontifical university - the studium - Cajetan became to all intents and purposes the pope's official theologian. His duties included choosing preachers for the papal liturgies and, in theory, approving the contents of the sermons which were delivered on such occasions.²⁷ During his period of office as Procurator General, he himself composed five such sermons, whose composition is a hybrid of the classical epideictic oration and the medieval thematic sermon.²⁸ While none of these pieces were specifically dedicated to Carafa, the cardinal was frequently amongst the distinguished audience to whom such sermons were addressed. As will be seen below, he himself commissioned orations of this type and was the dedicatee of others.

Carafa's patronage of Cajetan culminated in Cajetan's election as Master General of the Dominicans in 1508. One final piece of evidence to attest the close friendship and professional relationship between these two men can be seen from Carafa's will where Cajetan acts as the first of the witnesses (Pl. 1).²⁹

The group of works from Santa Maria della Pace all belong to Cajetan's early period of writing when he directed his intellectual energies towards the study of philosophy. These commentaries, primarily devoted to the work of Aristotle, were the fruits of his teaching at Padua, Pavia, Milan and Rome between 1493 and 1507. In philosophy, as well as

in theology, Cajetan attached himself to the Thomist system of thought. His period in Padua had brought him into the company of the Scotists and Averroists and it was against them that he directed his philosophical writing. Cajetan's knowledge and support of Aquinas' philosophical position would have made his work attractive to Cardinal Carafa. Carafa had a great devotion towards Saint Thomas Aquinas and believed that through his mother he was actually related to the saint. This was a connection of which he was proud to be reminded. The relationship is mentioned in the dedication of Cajetan's commentary on the Posterior Analytics: 'quod Divi Thomae Aquinatis cui maternum genus prosapia tua clarissima profudit operibus summopere delectaris'.³⁰ Aurelio 'Lippo' Brandolino also refers to Carafa's claim in a panegyric composed in honour of Saint Thomas Aquinas.³¹ Compelling evidence for Carafa's interest in Aquinas' theology and Thomist study in general also occurs in the preface to the first part of Cajetan's commentaries on the Summa theologica - a work which was destined to become the pre-eminent theological text for sixteenth-century Dominicans. In the dedication Cajetan states quite clearly that it was his patron, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, who had urged and encouraged him to undertake this awesome task.³²

Other manifestations of Carafa's devotion to Saint Thomas Aquinas will be discussed in later chapters. Suffice it to say here that it was a contributory factor in his embellishing and endowing a chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, dedicating it to Aquinas (and the Virgin Annunciate) and instituting an annual visit by the Sacred College to this chapel on the saint's feast day. Thus, as observed by O'Malley³³,

Carafa became as powerful a patron of Aquinas as Pope Nicholas V several decades earlier. This promotion of the cult of Aquinas also had implications for Carafa's patronage of letters. On the evidence provided both by Burchard and the dedicatory prefaces of five orations written in honour of the saint, it appears that Carafa selected several well-known papal humanists to compose and perform laudatory set-pieces in his chapel on the saint's feast day.³⁴ As mentioned above, one of these composed by Aurelio 'Lippo' Brandolino (1454-1497), was dedicated to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and on the first page of this work the author specifically mentions that Carafa invited him to speak. Two others, composed by Antonio Pucci and Francesco Maturanzio respectively, survive in manuscript form in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The remaining two, one written by Thomas 'Fedra' Inghirami and the other by Martinus de Viana, were, like the Brandolino sermon, published in print.³⁵ As will be discussed in further detail below, these panegyrics share certain characteristics with the sermons delivered before the pope as part of the sacred liturgies. Given the strong evidence for Carafa's special commissioning of these works, they thus provide further proof of his familiarity with and preference for this particular style of humanist oratory.

Returning to the matter of Carafa's library and what this analysis of its contents reveals of his intellectual aptitudes and tastes, the following two deductions can be made. Firstly, his collection of legal manuscripts provides a clear indication of the active interest that he took in the interpretation and promulgation of civil and canon law. Secondly, his ownership of works by Cajetan emphasises the personal

devotion he held for Saint Thomas Aquinas and his admiration for the intellectual tradition that the saint had originated - a tradition with which Cajetan's scholarship was closely associated.

Patron of manuscript production and early printing

In the case of two of the library manuscripts, Carafa had commissioned German scribes to copy them and probably Italian illuminators to embellish them in a style typical of late fifteenth-century Neapolitan manuscript decoration (Pls. 2, 4).³⁶ To date seven other manuscripts can be identified by the coats of arms and other internal evidence as presentation copies executed for Oliviero Carafa.³⁷ Two of these later belonged to a relative, Cardinal Antonio Carafa (1538-1591).³⁸ Out of these seven, the execution of two of these manuscripts was definitely ordered by Carafa himself; in the case of another, the evidence points towards its production as a gift. The status of the remaining four is in doubt.

Two late fifteenth-century manuscripts definitely bear the hallmarks of specially commissioned works by Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. The first, a handsomely decorated missal, was executed in 1488 for Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and may well have been used at a later date in his chapel of the Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples. This suggested function is borne out by the fact that most unusually the first two masses in the Sanctorale are for Saint Januarius, the saint to whom the chapel is dedicated.³⁹ The second, a manuscript copy of Panormita's letters,

contains Carafa's oration on Ferrante of Naples, which suggests that it might be another specially commissioned work.⁴⁰

Conversely, since the manuscript copy of Benedetto Maffei's summary of Pliny's Natural History is decorated with both the Carafa and Maffei coat of arms (Pl. 9), the production of this manuscript is far more likely to have been ordered by Maffei himself.⁴¹

In the case of the remaining four manuscripts, all of which carry Carafa's coat of arms, there is good evidence for the cardinal's involvement with some aspect of the manuscripts' production. In the case of the two manuscripts containing translations by Andrea Brenta from various Greek authors, one was copied by the Neapolitan scribe, Pietro Ippolito da Luni,⁴² and the other by Brenta himself with the rubrication by Bartolommeo Sanvito.⁴³ Both were produced in the 1470s at a time when Brenta held the position of secretary to Cardinal Carafa.

A similar kind of personal connection occurs in the circumstances surrounding the production of the presentation copy of Jacopo Mirabelle's translation of Saint Basil's sermon against drunkenness, Sermo contra ebrios, catalogued by Quaritch in 1931.⁴⁴ A view has been expressed,⁴⁵ that the script is similar to the hand of the Neapolitan humanist, Pietro Ursuleo. The present location of this manuscript is unknown so this hypothesis cannot be checked. Nevertheless it should be noted that Ursuleo accompanied Carafa on his naval expedition against the Turks,⁴⁶ and therefore the two men knew one another well.

Finally, as discussed above, Pucci's panegyric on Aquinas would have been of great personal interest to Carafa.⁴⁷ In all four instances, therefore, it is possible that either the author or copyist, given his personal contacts with the cardinal, commissioned the production of the manuscript in question and then presented it to his patron.

Alternatively Carafa, due to his interest in the content of the work, may have had it copied and illuminated at his own behest.

Since the publication of the checklist of manuscripts presented to Carafa in my article on the cardinal's library, two further fifteenth-century manuscripts have come to my attention. Since neither are embellished with Carafa's coat of arms they do not have the status of presentation copies. Nevertheless both works are dedicated to him and therefore provide an insight as to Carafa's intellectual concerns and preferences. In the case of the manuscript copy of Lodovico da Ferrara's handbook on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics (recently discovered in the Newberry Library, Chicago⁴⁸), the author makes a clear statement in the preface that Cardinal Oliviero Carafa had commissioned this work from him.⁴⁹ As described in the previous chapter Carafa as Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans had secured the office of Procurator General for this erudite Thomist scholar. As in the case of his successor, Cajetan, Ludovico, during his procuratorship, produced five sermons⁵⁰ which were given on designated feast days as part of the papal liturgy. One is presented, therefore, with yet another instance of Carafa's sphere of influence as regards this genre of Renaissance religious oratory. Ludovico's study of Aristotle's Ethics at Carafa's behest also apparently contributed to the Dominican's scholarly

reputation, since it was mentioned specifically in his funerary oration.⁵¹ It also appears as an epithet on his epitaph in Viterbo.⁵²

The second newly discovered manuscript (now in the Henry Davis Collection of the British Library), contains an excerpt from Suidas entitled, 'Epistola ad Theodosium Judeorum principem et eiusdem Theodosii responsio ad eundem Philippum',⁵³ This manuscript is of especial interest to the scholar of Renaissance manuscripts because it is one of the earliest Italian examples of an original leather binding tooled in gold. It thus keeps company with Carafa's personal copy of Cajetan's commentaries on Aristotle's De anima (Pl. 6).

The preface states that the Bishop of Tropea had had this Latin translation made by Francesco Filelfo from a Greek manuscript owned by Cardinal Bessarion at his and Theodore of Gaza's request.⁵⁴ From Quaritch's description of Carafa's manuscript of Basil's 'Sermo contra ebrios', it appears that this manuscript also contained the same excerpt from Suidas.⁵⁵ It would therefore seem that Carafa had some fondness for this piece. The instigator of the translation of this late tenth-century Byzantine lexicographical compendium must have been Pietro Balbi, bishop of Tropea (1465-1479), who himself had a reputation as a scholar and translator of the Greek patristics. As such he belonged to a small coterie of scholars, Theodore of Gaza (1400-1475), Francesco Filelfo (1398-1481), and Carafa's secretary, Andrea Brenta, amongst them who were highly competent scholars of Greek.⁵⁶ The commissioning of this particular translation can be dated before 1479, the year of Balbi's death, and the reason for sending it Carafa's influence in southern

Italy where Balbi's Calabrian diocese lay. As will be discussed in further detail below, this translation also provides further evidence for Carafa's interest in and sponsorship of the study and translation of Greek classical and patristic authors.

Carafa's name also figures in the dedications of a large number of incunabula, but, apart from the two printed editions of Cajetan's work from the library of Santa Maria della Pace, none of these displays the characteristics of a presentation copy. Nevertheless, like other highly-placed ecclesiastics, Carafa took an interest in the new technology of printing. While he was still Cardinal of Sant'Eusebio, the printing press under the management of Gregorius Lauer of Würtzburg was producing editions from a monastery attached to this titular church. Since Lauer's edition of Diogenes Laertius' Vitae philosophorum (produced circa 1471-1472 under the editorship of the Neapolitan scholar, Francesco Elio Marchese), was dedicated to Oliviero Carafa, he had presumably offered his support to this new venture.⁵⁷ It was also general practice for those early printers to utilise the services of clerics to proof-read their publications. While Carafa's energies must have been largely directed towards other matters, it appears that he did act occasionally in this capacity. In a later edition of the Discordantiae Sanctorum Hieronymi et Augustini, Filippo Barbieri makes a clear statement in the preface that this edition has been reprinted with a number of errors eliminated under the guidance of the Cardinal of Naples.⁵⁸

Carafa's patronage of scholars

At least fifty scholars dedicated one or more of their works to Cardinal Carafa during his lifetime.⁵⁹ As a man of considerable power and influence, Carafa would have been a person from whom scholars would naturally seek endorsement of their literary efforts. Nevertheless, the fact that such dedications were made would not necessarily argue for Carafa himself having an informed knowledge of or interest in the contents of these works. However, certain examples are worth discussing in further detail since they complement and amplify what is known of Carafa's scholarly preoccupations.

Of these scholars, those who were in Cardinal Carafa's household provide a convenient starting point. In his treatise, Cortese states clearly that one way a cardinal might earn a reputation for virtue and scholarship was by employing scholars in his household.⁶⁰ It is clear from the provision in his will that Carafa had a large household, as was normal practice for a man of his status. It also appears from a number of contemporary statements that it was a well-ordered establishment which was both frugal in its lifestyle and scholarly in its pursuits. Marco Girolamo Vida in his *Epicedion* praises it warmly: 'casta fuit domus ac turpi non prodiga luxu'.⁶¹ Andrea Brenta - himself a member of the household - writes of the pleasure afforded him by his association with Carafa and his famiglia:

Tum propter iusticiam & mores: tu[m] & propter tua[m] in omnes
singularem humanitatem & clementiam: cuius virtutis signu[m] hoc

maximum est: quod familiam tuam omni virtute praeeditam anni laboribus exhaustam: hac honestissime voluptate recreas & confirmas.⁶²

This Paduan humanist was first documented as a member of Carafa's famiglia in 1476 when he accompanied Carafa to the coronation of Beatrice of Aragon in Naples. He may well have entered the household at an earlier date. He combined his duties as a secretary to the cardinal with teaching as professor of rhetoric and classical languages at Rome's university, the Studio Romano.⁶³ Several entries in the early records of the Vatican library's loans, dated between 1477 and 1480, identify him as a member of the Cardinal of Naples' famiglia.⁶⁴ He also spent time at the Cardinal's villa on the Quirinal hill. In the dedication to Sixtus IV in an undated printed translation of Hippocrates' De natura hominis, Brenta refers to the villa as a refuge from the crowded and unhealthy conditions of the plague-ridden city.⁶⁵ As will be seen in chapter six, Carafa's villa was embellished with inscriptions and epigrams composed by classical authors. Two of these, recorded by Schrader in the sixteenth century, are attributed to Xenophon and Cyrus.⁶⁶ One of Brenta's loans from the Vatican library was a copy of Xenophon's account of his expedition with Cyrus as related in the Anabasis.⁶⁷ It therefore seems highly probable that it was Brenta who supplied a selection of appropriate texts for his patron's rural retreat.

Brenta dedicated several of his works to his employer and patron. As stated above, two of these - in both cases a compilation of various

pieces - survive in manuscript form and carry the hallmarks of presentation copies. One volume contains a number of texts collected together as a form of tribute to Julius Caesar.⁶⁸ While its principal item is Brenta's translation of Dio Cassius' record in Greek of Caesar's 'Oratio Belgicae ad milites habita', it also includes extracts from Caesar's own writings and a number of epigrams in praise of Caesar from ancient and modern sources.⁶⁹ While the decoration of this manuscript, and one of its rubrics, indicate that it was intended for Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, the volume begins with a dedicatory letter to Sixtus IV. In general the overarching themes of this collection are those of commemoration of a great classical hero and debate on the true nature of nobility. The motto inscribed on the first page - conter et contraria virtus - gives an insight as to the nature of this volume's contents and betrays an interest in the genus demonstrativum - that branch of classical rhetoric where, in the light of a specially selected topic, praise and blame is appropriately distributed.

A similar kind of preoccupation is again evident from the contents of the second volume of work that Brenta presented to his patron, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa.⁷⁰ In the dedication letter to the manuscript copy of his translation from the Greek of the 'Oratio funebris Lysiae',⁷¹ Brenta makes it clear that he understands the function of this type of classical funerary oratory. He therefore shares with a number of other humanists attached to the papal court (and by extension their ecclesiastical patrons) a familiarity with the epideictic mode of classical rhetoric which was customarily employed for the composition of funeral orations which were designed to celebrate in a fairly emotive

vein the achievements of the deceased. Brenta also employs, furthermore, this rhetorical mode very effectively in the second of the pieces contained in this volume - the 'Oratio in convivii laudem habita apud Cardinalem Oliverium Neapolitanum'. On this occasion the subject of praise is Oliviero Carafa himself and the oration takes the form of an exaltation of the cardinal and his manifold virtues, ending on a peroration in which it is predicted that he will ascend the papal throne.⁷² The remainder of the volume provides further evidence of Brenta's Greek scholarship, containing as it does his translations of one of Saint John Chrysostom's sermons on the so-called betrayal by the Jews and an extract from Hippocrates' writings on medicine.

On the latter author, Brenta was something of an expert. He dedicated an autograph copy of a translation of Hippocrates' De insomniis to Sixtus IV, and translated other works by this author.⁷³ A printed edition of his translation of De insomniis appeared in 1480 and another undated edition under the title Hippocrates de natura hominis, whose contents was dedicated, among others, to Oliviero Carafa.⁷⁴ One of the works which Brenta, as a member of Carafa's household, borrowed from the Vatican library was a volume of Hippocrates.⁷⁵ Given the two dedications to Carafa of translations of Hippocrates' work, and indeed Brenta's own reference, in the dedicatory letter of the 'Lex medicinae', to Carafa's support of writers on jurisprudence, dialectic, philosophy and medicine,⁷⁶ it can safely be assumed that Carafa shared Brenta's enthusiasm for this Greek author.

In the case of another work by Brenta, dedicated specifically to Carafa, we find this scholar making a contribution to the sacred oratory of the papal court. The printed edition of In pentecosten oratio acts as a record of the sermon composed by Brenta and addressed to Sixtus IV as part of the papal mass for the feast of Pentecost, 18 May, 1483.⁷⁷ In it Brenta mounts a learned defence for the Church's doctrine on the Holy Spirit as integral to the Trinity. Typical for this genre, Brenta does not present any new or controversial ideas on this complex theological issue.⁷⁸ His purpose, rather, is to arouse deeper appreciation of an accepted viewpoint, a viewpoint shared by his ecclesiastical audience. Since in the preface he makes a fulsome tribute to Carafa's encouragement and guidance in the composition of this work,⁷⁹ it is worthwhile isolating two instances in this text where Brenta's arguments accord with what is known of Carafa's convictions as regarding personal morality and religious principle.

In the opening part of the oration, Brenta presents an ideal of Christian life:

Spiritu namque Deum colimus honesta cogitando, bene dicendo, recte agendo et in caelo pietatis thesauros qui nullo fortunae aut casus impetu eripi possint responendo.⁸⁰

This litany of pious virtues and the spiritual benefits attendant upon them accords well with Carafa's exemplary public and private demeanour. Brenta also utilises his theme in order to expound upon the virtues of harmony as opposed to discord. Thus in his view the Trinity exemplifies

the perfect reconciliation of the one and the three and heaven and earth reflect that unity.⁸¹ This appeal to the notion of a spiritually ordained hierarchical and harmonious order on earth would undoubtedly have appealed to Carafa whose services to the Church were, in principal, devoted to achieving such ends.

Brenta belonged to the Cardinal's household in the early years of Carafa's residence in Rome. By contrast, the humanist and churchman Jacopo Sadoletto (1477-1547) joined the household when Carafa was already well-established as the powerful Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, and resident in the monumental Palazzo Orsini on the Piazza Navona. (The palace will be discussed in further detail in chapter six.) In Carafa's funeral oration (1511), Sadoletto states that he had lived in the household for twelve years, but he tended to be careless about times and dates. However, the view given by his modern biographer, Richard Douglas, that Sadoletto left Ferrara for Rome between 1498 and 1499 and that, due to his connections with the d'Este family who had close diplomatic links with Naples, he entered the Cardinal's household shortly after his arrival in Rome, would seem to be correct.⁸² Carafa apparently intended the young man for the Church and shortly after 1506 acquired for him the benefice of San Lorenzo in Damaso (the Palazzo Orsini was partially in the parish of that church). It is difficult to estimate Carafa's impact on Sadoletto's intellectual formation. Sadoletto himself implies in a letter written to Paul IV in 1555 that it was a significant one. In the letter, he terms himself a foster son (alumnus) of the Carafa family, reminds the pope of the education that they had received together under Oliviero Carafa's roof, and acknowledges that whatever reputation he had

earned as a man of learning he owed to the educational and moral benefits received from his residence in Carafa's household.⁸³ Nevertheless, Sadoletto's literary output at that time was not as substantial as it later became. He probably received encouragement for his studies, and, due to his patron's orthodox intellectual tastes, was directed towards the works of the Greek and Latin Fathers, a process which benefited his work at a later date.

Other than the funerary oration, there survive two other pieces of Sadoletto's writing directly addressed to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. In the case of the funeral oration, its structure derives from the classical laudatio funebris and thus the epideictic branch of rhetoric. It opens with an exordium where Sadoletto conventionally praises the merits of the deceased and states his own inadequacy for the task in hand. He then moves on to the body of the text where he speaks of Carafa's family ancestry, his nationality, the circumstances of his noble birth, his education and aptitude for study, his promotion and achievements, first as Archbishop of Naples and second as Cardinal of Naples. The oration ends on a peroration of lamentation over the loss of this remarkable statesman and patron of art.⁸⁴ The ideal of public service is evident throughout the oration as appropriate to its classical model, evolved primarily to eulogize civic heroes. In terms of its form and content, it belongs to the genre of Renaissance funerary oration which was adopted by the humanists of the papal court to celebrate the deeds of popes and cardinals. More significantly, it presents faithfully the outlines of its classical model and shows little dependance on medieval preaching forms.⁸⁵

The two other orations dedicated by Sadoletto to Carafa are also humanist in style. The first - a printed edition of circa 1510, and therefore the earliest prose treatise that can positively be attributed to Sadoletto - has an autograph letter to Carafa appended to it.⁸⁶ In this letter, Sadoletto names Carafa as his patron and offers the standard formula as to why he had presented this treatise to a man noted for his wisdom and erudition. As the title, De bello suscipiendo contra Turcas ad Ludovico regem Galliarum oratio, indicates, the theme of this treatise is one of solidarity between the Christian powers against the Turkish threat. In particular it warns of the dangers of princely discord and pleads for the restoration of the Christian commonwealth under the king of France. In common with many such literary exhortations, the treatise demonstrates a certain political naivety coupled with a genuine concern for peace and the unity of Europe. The second piece dedicated to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa is a manuscript copy of Sadoletto's translation of Aristotle's letter to Alexander on the freedom of the world.⁸⁷ Given Carafa's active involvement in halting the advance of the Turks, these two pieces would have accorded with his preoccupations as a high-ranking ecclesiastic and statesman. In general terms they belong to a group of fifteenth-century humanist texts which reflect a concern for the current political ills and a nostalgia for what was deemed the universality of the classical imperial age.⁸⁸

Relatively little is known of the other members of Carafa's household apart from his young relative, Gian Pietro Carafa, later Pope Paul IV. As discussed in chapter two, Oliviero Carafa was instrumental in promoting Gian Pietro in the early stages of his ecclesiastical career.

Sadoletto at a later date also had cause to recall how both young men enjoyed the scholarly and well-ordered facilities of the cardinal's household.⁸⁹ The humanist, Giovanni Battista Almadiano, was also a member of the household and as such was a witness in 1509 to Carafa's will. In the same year, Paris de Grassis refers to Marcus Antonius Magnus as Carafa's chancellor.⁹⁰ In all probability the famous poet, literary theorist and cardinal, Pietro Bembo (1470-1547), and the prelate, Federigo Fregoso, were also for a short time members of Carafa's famiglia.⁹¹ Too little is known, however, about these scholars' period of residence to posit any contribution by Carafa to their literary output.

Other humanists' work dedicated to Oliviero Carafa can be divided, for convenience, into a number of literary genres. The letters of Panormita (1394-1471), addressed to such highly-placed persons as Pope Pius II, Ferrante King of Naples, Francesco Sforza Duke of Milan, and Borso d'Este Marquis of Ferrara, represent a model of epistolatory prose, based on such classical precedents as the letters of Cicero.⁹² As such they would have had a practical use for Carafa who, like the author, was actively concerned with conducting matters of state on behalf of the Pope and the King of Naples.

A number of late fifteenth-century poems survive in manuscript form and act as a form of graceful tribute to Carafa by celebrating both his lineage and ecclesiastical status. In a volume of twenty-five odes composed by the humanist and diplomat, Antonio Geraldini (1449-1489), and addressed to Pope Paul II and his cardinals, one commemorates the

elevation of Oliviero, Cardinal of Naples, to the title of SS Pietro e Marcellino.³³ In a volume of poems by the humanist Francesco Maturanzio (1443-1518), is an ode, again addressed to Oliviero Carafa of Naples, which pays tribute to his victorious role as admiral of the papal fleet sent against the Turks.³⁴ This type of poetic compliment receives a more complex treatment in the series of eight epigrams composed by the South Italian humanist Antonio Flaminio. Here the author has taken the Carafa family impresa of the stadera, converted it into the more classical form of libra, and written a series of epigrams in honour of its symbolic properties.³⁵ The author's intentions is spelt out in the preface to the first of these epigrams: 'libra: i[n]signia Car[di]nall[is] Neapo[lita]ni: ei[us] i[n]scrip[ti]o hoc fac & vive[s]'. As pointed out by Reynolds, Flaminio clearly proposes a connection between the Carafa family emblem and the notion of equity and divine justice. Reynolds' suggestion is well-supported by epigrams like:

Aurea iucundu[m] te toll[et] ad [ae]lthera virtus
Si fueri[n]t animi pondera iusta tui:

Splendida Ca[ri]raph[ae] miraras pondera gentis:
Aequa potest homines addere libras deis.³⁶

However, her citation of authors, including Cicero, Lactantius, Augustine, Aquinas and Dante, in order to account for Flaminio's proposal of such an connection is unnecessary. The stadera on monuments or objects personally connected with Oliviero Carafa invariably appears with the motto hoc fac et vives, and Flaminio himself acknowledges the

dependance of the one upon the other. The source for this motto, 'do this and live', is Luke (10:28). It records a statement reputedly made by Christ to a lawyer who had enquired how he might acquire eternal life. The implications of the exchange are that, in order for a man to obtain salvation, he must obey God's laws not merely by knowing them but by practising them. This is how the passage was interpreted in the glosses.⁹⁷ It was therefore an appropriate text to accompany the family device of the stadera, which had long been an ancient symbol of fair judgement. Carafa was himself an expert on and practitioner of law. Read in the context of this biblical passage, Flaminio's poetic musings on the allegorical significance of the Carafa emblem require no further investigation of their literary source.

The content of three additional works in prose relates to various preoccupations of Carafa as a prince of the Church. All three are polemical in tone and refer to contemporary issues facing the Church. They therefore belong to the same genre as Sadoletto's treatise discussed above. The first, by a Venetian scholar, Girolamo Donati, was written as a defence of the Roman Church against the Greek Orthodox Church.⁹⁸ In his preface, the author gives a brief account of how he had acquired his knowledge of Greek on the island of Crete, and that his choice of dedicatee was due to Carafa's age and experience in both learning and religious custom. He also suggests that once again Carafa had been responsible for correcting errors in the work.

The second of these topical works, entitled De calamitatibus suorum temporum, was composed by the famous Carmelite scholar from Mantua,

Giovanni Battista Spagnoli (Mantovano, da Mantova, 1447-1516).⁹⁹ As its title suggests, this work deals with the calamities of the day which the author attributes to divine providence and defines as an incitement to moral reform. As such it stands out in sharp contrast to this author's prolific output in theology, Greek, natural science and Latin verse.¹⁰⁰ Spagnoli had lived in Rome for a number of years and as General of the Carmelite Order had official contacts with Cardinal Carafa. It was therefore fitting that he should dedicate the 1488 printed edition of this work to the Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, a person who had for many years been concerned with the political affairs of Italy and involved in diplomatic negotiations with both Italian and European rulers.

A work on a similar subject, the 1505 edition of Agostino Nifo's De nostrarum calamitatum causis, was also dedicated to the Cardinal of Naples.¹⁰¹ Drawing heavily on Aristotle's De generatione et corruptione, and on Ptolemy, Nifo speculates in this treatise on the causes of such calamities as infections, military atrocities and crimes. He also calculates under which planets such events as Charles VIII's invasion of Italy occurred. Since Carafa had personal experience of this particular event, the choice of dedicatee was an appropriate one.

A short printed treatise, De laudibus pacis oratio by Benedetto Maffei (1429-1494), is another example of this type of contemporary subject. Although it is dedicated to Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, this treatise is basically a laudatory piece on the benefits of peace achieved by Sixtus IV in his treaty with Naples in 1482. The introductory letter thus supplies a catalogue of Sixtus IV's

achievements, including his foundation of the Vatican library and the construction of the Ponte Sisto across the Tiber.¹⁰² Maffei also dedicated to Carafa, at a later date, his abridgement of Pliny's Natural History.¹⁰³ This finely produced manuscript carries both the Carafa and Maffei coat of arms (Pl. 9). (The fact that this fairly humble family from Verona could couple their arms with those of the Carafa family is an indication of how the Maffei by virtue of their service in the papal Curia had attained a certain social standing in Rome.¹⁰³) Once again there is evidence that the book's subject - an orderly and accurate summary of the encyclopedic contents of the thirty-seven books of the Natural History - could have had a special relevance for Carafa. Several of the inscriptions recorded in his villa on the Quirinal were taken from Pliny's Natural History.¹⁰⁴ It is therefore fitting that he should have once owned a handy source for such inscriptions.

Another work on a 'scientific' theme dedicated to Carafa is Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola's (1469-1533) posthumous publication of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem.¹⁰⁵ This grand apology for Catholic theology, with its refutation of those scholars who use astrology to defy the teachings of the Church, would have been conducive to Carafa's orthodox taste in matters of religious doctrine and belief. There is, however, an additional, and more personal, reason why Giovanni Francesco chose to dedicate this work to Carafa as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina. He was related to Carafa through marriage (see Table II). The choice of dedication to a powerful relative who was also well-known for his orthodoxy was thus entirely apposite.

Carafa's patronage of the Dominican theologian, Cajetan, has been discussed in some detail above. On the evidence presented in this discussion, his support of Cajetan's scholarship can be characterised as directed towards the Dominican's interpretation of certain key works of Aristotle as well as the great body of theological and philosophical material produced by Saint Thomas Aquinas.¹⁰⁶ It is in the former category that Ludovico da Ferrara's handbook on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics belongs.¹⁰⁷ The fact that Carafa is the dedicatee of a work which deals with the Aristotelian ideal of magnificentia is of course highly significant as regards Carafa's attitude towards expenditure on art. As such it will be dealt with in further detail in chapter eight below.¹⁰⁸ In more general terms the dedication of this piece of scholarly interpretation offers further evidence for Carafa's enlightened support of the Dominican scholarship over and above his intervention in the Order's government and administration.

Both Ludovico da Ferrara and Cajetan in their capacity as Procurator Generals of the Dominicans penned orations which played a part in the sacred liturgies of the papal chapel. The printed edition of the five orations by Ludovico contains, furthermore, a dedicatory preface addressed to Carafa.¹⁰⁹ Two other Dominicans, Nicholas Schömberg and Timotheo de Totis were also authors of such sermons. Both men were familiar to Carafa in his capacity as Cardinal Protector.¹¹⁰ The authors' varying degrees of indebtedness to Cardinal Carafa presuppose at the very least Carafa's familiarity with this particular branch of literary endeavour.

By way of contrast to these essentially serious and scholarly works, Carafa also had a number of more light-hearted pieces written in his honour. For example, the novella writer, Masuccio Salernitano, dedicated one of his stories to the Cardinal of Naples.''' It tells of how two young Romans by their wit and audacity robbed a Bolognese lawyer. This lawyer bought a gold cup and arranged for it to be sent to his house. One of the youths took a lamprey to the lawyer's house and told his wife that her husband wanted this fish cooked for a number of fellow lawyers and the cup sent back to the shop. The simple woman believed this story and duly did what she was told. Naturally, when the lawyer returned and found his cup missing, he was very angry and, after a heated exchange with his wife, went in search of his stolen property. In the meantime, the second youth went to the house and told the wife that the cup had been found and that her husband now wanted the fish sent to him. The woman, glad that the cup had been recovered, gave the deliciously cooked fish to the young man. Thus the two rogues acquired both a valuable cup and a delicious meal into the bargain. It is impossible to know whether a story of this sort was in fact to Carafa's taste, but if it was, it would indicate that he had a humorous side to his personality, as well as the dignified and high-minded qualities constantly alluded to in numerous dedications composed in his honour.

Pasquino

Another and more unusual aspect of Carafa's patronage of letters is his sponsorship of the popular literary genre of the pasquinades. The literature on the pasquinades and the statue, nicknamed Pasquino, from

which these poems derive their name, is extensive.¹¹² Recently Ann Reynolds has dealt very thoroughly with the feast of Pasquino and the part that Carafa played in its foundation and organisation.¹¹³ The following discussion will therefore rely extensively on Reynolds' published findings, but also highlight the most salient points in respect of Carafa's patronage of this event.

The pasquinades owe their origins to a mutilated piece of statuary placed by Cardinal Oliviero Carafa on the corner of his city palace in Rome. This palace, rented from the Orsini family, was situated in the most populated district of Rome - the Parione - and on the Via Papalis, the main ceremonial route from the Vatican to San Giovanni in Laterano.¹¹⁴ Schrader (1592) records that below this statue was an inscription indicating Carafa's act of benevolence and the year, 1511.¹¹⁵ While the fifteenth-century palace no longer stands, the statue can still be seen on its original site on one corner of the present Palazzo Braschi (Pls. 10-11). The battered remains of this two-figure group have now been identified as a Roman copy of a Hellenistic sculpture, which once depicted Menelaus supporting the body of the dead Patroclus.¹¹⁶

The first record of Pasquino appears to be in a poem written circa 1499-1500 which describes the marvels of Rome. The statue is referred to in the following terms:

Ecci un mastro pasquille imparione
dal sasso spinse el so nimicho in ario

questo e collui che extinse gerione.¹¹⁷

An entry by Burchard for 13 August, 1501, provides the first indication of the tradition for attaching satirical verses to this statue. On this occasion the verses were directed against Alexander VI: 'affixa fuit cedula statue magistri Pasquino nuncupate, site in angula domus r. d. cardinalis Neapolitani, de obitu pape se recedat ad urbe.'¹¹⁸

Collections of these verses first appear in printed form in 1509 and continued to be published at regular intervals until 1536, when formal publication was discontinued. The feast held in Pasquino's honour continued sporadically until 1543 when it was officially suppressed. The practice of writing and affixing verses to the statue (Pl. 12), continued well into the eighteenth century.¹¹⁹ Three volumes of these Carmina survive from Carafa's lifetime and provide vital information on the origins and character of this literary festival.

The first printed edition of the Carmina contains verses in Latin except for four pages of Italian verse at the end of this volume.¹²⁰ The preface of this edition gives a clear description of the mutilated state of this ancient statue (identified here, as in the 1499 poem, as Hercules, a common mistake made in these early sources), and Carafa's part in rescuing it from its neglected and decayed state:

Ad angulu[m] domus Car[dinalis] Neapo[litani] statue & q[ui]ldem
insignis, olim est Herculis, ut q[ui]ldam co[n]necta[n]t, quae
trunca inutilave cruribus brachiis ac naso in loco no[n] multos
pedes ab eo in quo Car[dinalis] inpena nu[n]c erecta co[n]spicitur

distante, abiecta iacuit ac sordibus obducta a[n]nos complures,
co[n]tra illam literator seu magister ludi cui Pasquino Pasqillove
erat nomen habitabat, unde post[ea] statuæ nomen inditum est.¹²¹

In this instance, the name of Pasquino is said to have originated from a local grammarian or schoolmaster. During the sixteenth century other candidates were put forward including a sharp-tongued tailor and a barber-poet.¹²²

Pasquino's name clearly denotes the workings of a popular local tradition. However, by 1509 if not earlier, the statue's identity had become more complex. It is clear from the text of the 1509 Carmina that Pasquino had taken on the guise of the classical god, Janus. In the preface, it is stated that, on the feast of Saint Mark, it had been the custom to ornament a stone bench (sedile) near the statue with tapestries and hangings, with the priests from San Lorenzo in Dammaso in attendance. This ritual had then been extended to Pasquino who was embellished with painted decoration and poetic verses. Now the service of both a painter and a scholar from the cardinal's household were required and every year the number of verses grew. The year when the statue had taken the form of Janus, three thousand verses were placed there.¹²³ It is also evident from this account of the origins of the festival that Cardinal Carafa had taken a dominant role in its conception and organisation.

The preface also supplies a short description of the appearance and significance of Janus in ancient times. References are made to the

staff that Janus traditionally carried in his right hand and the keys which he held in his left hand to denote his role as guardian of thresholds and doorways and also his white temple, square in plan, whose doors were left open in wartime.¹²⁴ As Reynolds writes, the choice of Janus was probably dictated by the god's association with war, since many of the poems make topical allusions to Julius II's military campaigns.¹²⁵ Another factor, which Reynolds has overlooked, was Carafa's personal regard for Janus. As discussed in chapter five, the sculpted decoration of Carafa's chapel in Naples - the Succorpo - depicts the stadera several times (Pls. 97, 101, 103, 104, 106). In the majority of cases the weight of the stadera takes the form of a Janus head. In the context of the Succorpo, the Janus head could act as a compliment to Saint Januarius to whom the chapel was dedicated.¹²⁶ This Janus device could also allude to the virtue of Prudence - a common enough analogy as indicated in the preface of the 1509 Carmina: 'q[ue]l esset prudentissimus fuisse dictus est bifrons Prudens eu[m]'.¹²⁷ Prudence was a virtue for which Carafa himself was praised. Given this particular nexus of personal associations, there is an even greater likelihood that Carafa was responsible for the choice of this particular classical deity as the focus for the feast of 1509.

In one of the poems, the literary supervisor of the festival is named as Donatus. Donatus Pollius was a Florentine scholar who taught for a period at the Studio Romano.¹²⁸ It is therefore likely (and references in the later editions of the Carmina confirm this), that scholars from the university offered their contributions to this literary fešta. The university was after all situated in close proximity to Carafa's

residence and at least one other member of his household taught there.¹²⁹ As pointed out by Reynolds, this type of celebration was not without precedent. Burchard indicates that the cardinals were assigned specific responsibilities for the decoration of the Roman streets on major feast days.¹³⁰ However, the form taken by the feast of Pasquino was peculiarly classical in its derivation. It had similarities to the Priapea, the ancient custom of affixing short humorous poems or epigrams to the statue of Priapus, the god of fertility and gardens. Reenactment of this type of ritual had become popular in early sixteenth-century Rome. Possibly the most celebrated were the ceremonies inaugurated by Johann Goritz, the first in the church of Sant'Agostino and centred upon Andrea Sansovino's sculpted group of Saint Anne, the Virgin and Christ child and Raphael's fresco of the prophet Isaiah, and the second in his villa near the forum of Trajan. These events were commemorated by the publication of the famous collection of poems - the Coryciana - which pays tribute to Goritz's patronage and learning.¹³¹

Given that the feast of Pasquino was an earlier expression of a classical ritual of this type, there is every possibility that Carafa was responsible for its inauguration, transferring it from the privacy of his suburban villa (embellished with epigrams¹³²), to a more public location in the heart of Rome.

In the preface of the 1509 Carmina, the feast of Pasquino is twinned with that of Saint Mark. This feast day was traditionally celebrated by an urban procession. Burchard, for example, describes Saint Mark's day

pallatio apud sanctum Petrum equitaturus ad sanctum Marcum: equitavit precedente ipsum cruce et cardinalibus papam sequentibus, ut alias, per Parionem, viam processionis, paratus amictu, alba, cingulo, capuccio rubro et bireto similiter de veluto cremesino et desuper stola preciosa'.¹³³ In the Carmina several references are made to the special relationship between Janus/Pasquino and Saint Mark.¹³⁴ Elsewhere there are allusions to Rome's enmity towards Venice, and Julius II's warlike and imperialist stance towards not only the Venetians but also the Spanish, the French and the Turks.¹³⁵ Since Saint Mark was the patron saint of Venice, and the Pope was currently campaigning against the Republic, the organisation of the festival could well have had a political dimension. In other words, Carafa sought to regulate a popular tradition of his locality, and turn it to good effect on behalf of the Pope and his current policies. If this was his intention, he could not apparently entirely eradicate Pasquino's original function as a satirical mouthplace for the Roman populace, since many of the poems are very caustic about both literary pedants and the clergy.¹³⁶

Probably for this reason, the preface of the second edition of the Carmina (1510), is devoted to explaining how on this occasion the poems had been extensively corrected.¹³⁷ The author of the preface (probably Mazzochi), also admits to a degree of selection and, by implication, censorship. It is also clear that this celebration was a longstanding event: 'hanc carminum quae affixa spectaculo ludicro multis annis celebrari iam solito ad Pasquillu[m].¹³⁸ These verses were sent to be fixed to the statue.¹³⁹ Reference is made to epigrams, submitted by young men, which needed correction. Nevertheless, their authors'

participation was to be encouraged.¹⁴⁰ It would seem, therefore, that the feast of Pasquino had become by this date a kind of public literary competition which involved young aspiring literati. According to the author, this event was now better regulated and of a more professional standing. Nevertheless, many of the poems in this collection are again satirical and anti-clerical in tone.

For the 1510 feast, Pasquino had apparently been given the guise of Hercules striking off the head of Hydra.¹⁴¹ From the content of certain verses it appears that once again this classical hero had been chosen to symbolise Rome's might against her current adversaries. In one verse, Carafa is credited with the idea of the statue's various transformations each year:

Herculis haec statua est nota notissima in urbe
Quam Carrapha pius Cardineus posuit
In varias formas mutari sueta quot annis.¹⁴²

This debt to Carafa is taken up in another verse where he is made responsible for Pasquino's current guise and for the statue's eternal fame:

Haec sunt purpurei quae mens divina Carafae
Cogitat, haec tanto credite digna viro. . .
Debebit, Carrapha, tibi Pasquillus in aevum
Qui facis extinctum ne sibi nomen eat.¹⁴³

In 1511, the Carmina commemorated the death of Carafa.¹⁴⁴ This particular edition is of special interest since it has as its frontispiece a woodcut showing the statue with a black turban and cloak beneath a black canopy. The Cardinal's coat of arms appear on the statue's pedestal (Pl. 13).¹⁴⁵ As signified by the content of the poems in this edition, Pasquino had now taken on the allegorical identity of Luctus. Consequently the poems (principally in Latin but with a brief section in Italian and two in Spanish) focus on lamentation and eulogy. Interestingly in the second version of this edition, Carafa's patronage of architecture is given fulsome acknowledgement:

Parthenope, Carrapha domus, vidiq[ue]l theatrum

Instauratae aedes, structaq[ue]l templa deum.¹⁴⁶

In the third verse, his association with Minerva is also highlighted in terms of Minerva's attribute of the olive and the collegia sacra Minerva (an oblique reference to the Dominican church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, which had been the recipient of his patronage).¹⁴⁷ The former reference to the classical goddess was evidently conceived as a punning compliment to Carafa's Christian name of Oliviero, and indeed, as seen in later chapters, the olive figures prominently in the decoration of three artistic schemes devised for him. Elsewhere a veiled reference is made to his crusade against the Turks,¹⁴⁸ and a more overt statement about his unsuccessful bids for the Papacy.¹⁴⁹ Above all, Carafa's death is lamented in terms of Pasquino's loss of a powerful patron - mio degno signor napolitano.¹⁵⁰

For three years (1512-1514), the festival was under the sponsorship of the English cardinal, Cardinal Christopher Bainbridge, who took up residence in the Palazzo Orsini. On his death in 1515, the role of sponsor was taken up by another occupant of the palace, Cardinal Antonio del Monte. During these years the published Carmina became progressively more satirical in tone and were no longer confined to being performed and celebrated on Saint Mark's day.¹⁵¹

From the contents of the three surviving editions of the Carmina produced during Carafa's lifetime, it would seem that the Cardinal of Naples was responsible for transforming a spontaneous local tradition that grew up around a piece of antique statuary, placed by him on one corner of his city residence, into a more formal and highly structured occasion. By staging a festival involving the elaborate decoration of the statue itself, and editing and publishing the poetic verses written in honour of the day, he changed the function of Pasquino from a 'satiric bulletin board'¹⁵² into a vehicle for a controlled and stylised form of papal propaganda. The strength of the original popular tradition survived, nevertheless, in the anti-clerical and anti-intellectual tone of many of the poems in the first two editions of the published Carmina. The history of the feast of Pasquino and of Carafa's probable role in its instigation and character thus provides an intriguing example of the complex and sociable nature of Renaissance patronage, presenting elements of public competition, street theatre and replication of the rituals of ancient Rome.

There are two other fields of scholarly endeavour to which Carafa offered his influential support, details of which have already been touched upon in the preceding sections. It remains to be discussed why he did so and what relevance these two types of scholarship have to his patronage of art.

Carafa and Greek scholarship.

There is a body of evidence to suggest that Carafa was a patron of Greek studies in late fifteenth-century Rome. In the absence of any Greek works either in his library or dedicated to him, it would seem that he himself neither spoke nor read Greek with any degree of fluency. Nevertheless his employment as secretary of Andrea Brenta who had studied at Padua under Demetrio Calcondila,¹⁵³ and later taught Greek at Rome's Studio Romano is indicative of Carafa's role as a supportive patron of Greek study. Brenta, Filelfo, Sadoletto and Donato, all translated Greek texts at his behest. While certain of these translations derive from classical authors, a significant number were by Greek patristic authorities. Thus Carafa appears to have been party to another major area of intellectual endeavour in Renaissance Rome - the recovery and study of the writings and theology of the early Greek Fathers. Indeed the preface to Filelfo's translation from Suidas¹⁵⁴ places the Cardinal of Naples within a network of key contributors to this Renaissance revival of the Greek patristic heritage - Cardinal Bessarion, Pietro Balbi, Filelfo himself and Theodore of Gaza. One suspects, given these associates, that Carafa's interest in Greek studies derived from his south Italian origins and his close

connections to the Aragonese court in Naples where this type of scholarship was encouraged.¹⁵⁵

This study of Greek patristic literature was initiated primarily by humanists and not by professional theologians and their efforts were thus directed to the translation of these revered ancient texts.¹⁵⁶ This body of newly translated work also drew attention to the moral teachings and rhetorical powers of the early Church Fathers and it is not without interest that one Greek translation dedicated to Carafa was Basil's sermon on drunkenness. Two others - John Chrysostom's In proditione Judae and the Suidas - reiterate a common doctrinal theme. In the former the author mounts an impassioned polemic against the Jews who refused to recognise the true nature of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. The latter contains a powerful rhetorical description of the Virgin Mary's defence before the Jewish elders in the Temple of the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁷ This issue of the Hypostatic Union also plays a part in Lactantius' Divine Institutes (a manuscript copy of which probably once formed part of Carafa's library).¹⁵⁸ Thus all three texts betray a preoccupation with the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation and the Hypostatic Union. In this respect they share certain characteristics with many of the orations performed before the papal court as part of its sacred liturgies. As remarked by O'Malley, the reason why these particular doctrines received such preferential treatment in these sermons was precisely because they: 'constitute the central Christian mysteries as these are found in the New Testament and as they were propounded by the Fathers and councils of the early Church'.¹⁵⁹ As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter

four, the doctrines of the Incarnation and Hypostatic Union provide a key to the iconography of the mural paintings in Carafa's chapel in the Minerva. Furthermore, it appears that an important sub-theme of this painted programme involves the issue of true as opposed to erroneous knowledge of these holy mysteries. It seems legitimate, therefore, to highlight Carafa's personal familiarity with patristic texts which rehearse such arguments and to propose that they played a part in the process of selecting certain kinds of religious subject and pictorial detail for the painted scheme within his chapel in the Minerva.¹⁵⁰

Carafa and sacred oratory

It appears from John O'Malley's study of the sacred oratory of the Renaissance papal court that the two cardinals who made the greatest investment in the development of this particular rhetorical genre were Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and his close associate Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini.¹⁵¹ These specially commissioned sermons were designed to play a part in the sacred ritual of the papal court which, as Burchard and Paris de Grassis' records reveal, had become increasingly elaborate and courtly in style of presentation. It also appears from these two sources that Carafa was something of an expert in matters of liturgical protocol.¹⁵² The high rate of Carafa's professional and personal contacts with the authors of these orations¹⁵³ provide further evidence for his scrupulous regard for the ordering of the liturgy of the papal chapel. One incident documented by Paris de Grassis demonstrates particularly well this close personal involvement. Carafa's chancellor, Marcus Antonius Magnus, had prepared a sermon for the feast of Pentecost

on 29 May, 1509. On the vigil of that feast day, Julius II decided that it should be replaced by an oration on the defeat of the Venetians at Agnadello. This relatively rare example of a sermon with a political bias was delivered on the feast day and later published with a dedication to Magnus' employer, Cardinal Carafa.¹⁶⁴

In the case of the group of late fifteenth-century panegyrics in honour of Saint Thomas Aquinas which are comparable in style and content to many of the papal sermons, the evidence for Carafa's active intervention in the commissioning and supervision of their performance is very compelling.¹⁶⁵ Thus Carafa can be seen as one of the most important promoters of the revival of classical epideictic oratory in late fifteenth-century Renaissance Rome. It remains to be discussed what features of this particular literary genre might have appealed to Carafa and whether it affected the form and content of other kinds of artistic endeavour originated by him.

These sermons (together with their counterparts - popes' funeral orations and orations delivered before the cardinals in conclave¹⁶⁶) represent a revival of the epideictic genre of classical rhetoric, a demonstrative oratorical mode which, according to classical theory, should attempt to arouse feelings of wonder and amazement. Its essential aim was not the creation of new ideas or to debate the validity of old ideas, but rather to convey long-established 'truths' in a more persuasive way. The preacher would therefore tend to announce that he was dealing simply with God's acts, as exemplified by Christian doctrine, and thereafter mount an exercise of praise about them. The

intention of this particular type of sermon was therefore fundamentally conservative and dogmatic. As such it appears very much in tune with Carafa's acts of churchmanship and public demeanour as outlined in the previous chapter.

In classical theory the epideictic genre was designated ars laudandi et vituperandi and thus in these sermons praise is frequently accompanied by reproach, the latter acting as an effective device to throw the exemplary subject into sharper relief. One of the most vivid examples of a preacher using this method occurs in the peroration of Brandolino's panegyric to Saint Thomas Aquinas. Here the author deplores the current state of affairs with its abounding lack of faith and contempt for God and religion and argues that not so much would have been lost to the infidel had Christians imitated Saint Thomas Aquinas.¹⁶⁷ As remarked by O'Malley, in the face of such accusation: 'the scene at the Minerva must have been tense'¹⁶⁸ Nevertheless this kind of reproach had been directed towards Carafa on other occasions, most notably in the orations by Sadoletto, Battista Mantuanus and Nifo, discussed above.¹⁶⁹ It would seem that Carafa was susceptible to such impassioned addresses, possibly seeing them as legitimate means for stirring himself and others to a recommended course of action.

Most of the preachers at the papal court also tended to define Christian piety in terms of good deeds performed for the benefit of others.

Inghirami in his panegyric on Aquinas, for example, admits that the pursuit of knowledge is more laudible than the administration of public affairs. Nevertheless, he argues that the best combination is that of

study and public service.¹⁷⁰ Viana in his piece on Aquinas envisages this public service in terms of both chastity and such charitable activities as visiting orphans and widows.¹⁷¹ Doubtless this ideal of public service would have appealed to Carafa since it provided him with a moral justification for the kinds of daily activities in which he was customarily involved.

Renaissance epideictic oration is also a very 'visual' mode of literary expression, employing as it frequently does the rhetorical device of ekphrasis. The preacher of these sermons thus consistently invites his audience to 'look', 'view' and 'gaze' upon works and deeds invoked by his words. For example, Ludovico da Ferrara in his sermon on the Last Judgement appeals to his audience to use their visual sense rather than rely on his explanation.¹⁷² As such the sermon fulfills its intention admirably since such an appeal to imaginative visualization encourages an emotive non-intellectual response. Two examples from orations (whose performance Carafa undoubtedly witnessed), demonstrate how effectively their authors appealed to the visual senses. In the sermon delivered by the Neapolitan humanist, Pietro Gravina (c.1453-1528), on the feast of the Ascension, Gravina describes Christ's entry into heaven with all the descriptive detail of a representation of a Roman triumphal procession.¹⁷³ Inghirami states in his panegyric to Aquinas that the Church celebrates annually the feasts of the saints: 'so that their memory which has begun like a beautiful painting to fade with the lapse of time, might be renewed each year as if with new colours'.¹⁷⁴ When one considers the context of Carafa's frescoed chapel in which this

sermon was first delivered this metaphor gains considerably in its bold appeal to the visual senses.

While in terms of reference to biblical and patristic texts the contents of these sermons are impeccably Christian in their orientation, classical learning is also used as a means of dignifying their Christian subject. A common rhetorical device that is frequently employed is that of quanto magis. If a pagan example is adduced it is generally used as a means to demonstrate 'by how much more' the Christian example excels. In a similar fashion the heresies of the early Church are employed as a device for praising the superior merits of the Church. Thus Ludovico da Ferrara refers in one of his sermons to the conflicts of the patristic age as another sign of the triumph of orthodoxy.¹⁷⁵ As will be discussed in chapter four there appears to be a similar set of ideas governing the choice of subject and its pictorial treatment in one of the murals in Carafa's chapel in the Minerva.

These orations produced under the aegis of the papal court did not invariably present an unambiguous revival of the epideictic genre. In general it seems that the panegyrics in honour of Aquinas observed more self-consciously the precepts of this classical oratorical mode. By contrast, Bernardino Carvajal's oration delivered at the conclusion of mass immediately preceeding the papal conclave of 1492, where the author makes extensive use of key propositions, formal distinctions and apodeictic proofs, is far more representative of the philosophical approach towards preaching as embodied in medieval scholasticism.¹⁷⁶ The sermons produced by the Dominican Procurator Generals present an

interesting hybrid of the classical epideictic oration and the medieval thematic sermon. These Dominican sermons thus provide another example of the complexity of the relationship between scholasticism and humanism in the Renaissance.¹⁷⁷ They also serve as a symbol for the multifaceted nature of Carafa's patronage of scholarship which could be termed as simply humanist in its orientation and yet, as his support for Thomist theological study reveals, also displays a certain sympathy for the tenets of scholasticism.

Conclusion

In the last analysis Reynolds' designation of Carafa as a humanist remains untenable primarily because, with the exception of the oration in honour of Ferrante, Carafa wrote no humanist texts. It also fails singularly to acknowledge Carafa's interests in law, philosophy and theology. Meanwhile Douglas' assessment of Carafa as a 'learned and pious but apparently not stimulating mentor' for Jacopo Sadoletto,¹⁷⁸ does not do full justice to the varied and imaginative nature of Carafa's patronage of Renaissance learning.

He collected a library, the surviving remnants of which reflect his training in law and commitment to Thomist study. He commissioned the copying and illumination of classical and contemporary texts and he encouraged the new technology of printing with its attendant benefits of a wider circulation and higher standards of textual criticism. His reputation for erudition, together with his standing within the Sacred College and his employment of talented scholars within his household,

meant that authors naturally solicited his support by dedicating their work to him.

Apart from these conventional forms of cardinalate literary patronage, Carafa also appears to have been party to some of the most exciting initiatives within the intellectual life of Renaissance Rome.

His institution of an annual literary festival under the aegis of a classical piece of statuary - Pasquino - was both public-spirited and self-consciously classical in its style and intent. He also appears to have gained a reputation as a patron of Greek, attracting scholars of this classical language either to become part of his household or to dedicate to him the fruits of their study. His apparent awareness of the revival of epideictic rhetoric and its attendant dogmatic and emotive possibilities caused him to encourage its further development within the liturgical context of his chapel in the Minerva. Moreover he appears to have allowed certain expressive features of this literary genre to impinge upon the style and content of the paintings within this chapel.

While many of these sermons delivered to the papal court allude to classical learning, their contents are steadfastly Christian in orientation as appropriate to their original function. Certain of them betray, moreover, a scholastic mode of presentation and argument. In a similar fashion Carafa's patronage of Cajetan is indicative of a sympathy for the tenets of medieval scholasticism and its revival under the aegis of contemporary Dominican theology. In short, Carafa cannot

be seen as a practising humanist but rather as a patron of humanism without whose assistance Renaissance humanism in Rome could not have developed and evolved in the direction it did. Moreover his patronage did not end there but extended to the patronage of other branches of scholarship - law, philosophy and theology - subjects hitherto excluded from the scope of Renaissance humanism proper.¹⁷⁹ His patronage can thus be interpreted as eclectic embracing as it did the classical, scholastic and humanist strands of intellectual thought and practice which contributed to and made Rome's cultural renaissance the more distinctive.

Notes to Chapter 3

¹The following are indicative of the kinds of compliment paid to him by humanist authors:

- a) Antonio Beccadelli (Il Panormita). Dedicatory letter of 'Quintum epistolarum volumen', addressed to Oliviero Carafa, Archbishop of Naples, Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo Laurenziana, cod. laur. plut. 90 sup. 46, fol. 2^r: 'Verum tu pro tua singulari eruditione atque prudentia non solum venia sed laude & col[m]mendatione dignum eum iudicaturus es, qui tempori & moribus orationem accomodaverit'.
- b) Andrea Brenta. Dedicatory letter prefacing his Latin translation of 'Oratio funebris Lysiae', addressed to Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal of Naples, BAV, Vat. lat. 6855, fol. 2^r^v: 'Quoniam una cu[m] etate prudentia, iusticia, sapientia, honores, dignitates creverunt. Iam [e]l[n]f[im]l virtutis tue, pietatis & religionis nomen p[er] totam Italiam . . . fulget atque illustratur. Ita ab omnibus propter singularem tuam modestiam & sapientiam amaris, coleris & observaris . . . virtutisq[ue]l specimen ac nostri seculi decus'.
- c) Jacopo Sadoletto. In his funeral oration, BAV, Vat. lat. 9539, fol. 405^r: 'Et magnitudinem quidem illius ingenii multitudo disciplinarum ab eo percepta declarat: qui liberalibus litteris eruditus, ius civile, et pontificium brevi tempore perdidicit, parentem omnium bonarum artium philosophiam adiunxit, theologiam complexus est'.

²A. Reynolds, 'Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and the early cinquecento tradition of the feast of Pasquino', Roma humanistica: studia in honorem L. Ruysschaert, Humanistica Lovaniensia, XXXIVA (1985), pp. 178-208, esp. p. 183. See also ibid., 'The private and public emblems of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XLV (1983), pp. 273-284, esp. pp. 281-284.

³See A. Campana, 'The origins of the word "humanist"', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, IX (1946), pp. 60-73. See also the illuminating essay by P. O. Kristeller, 'The humanist movement', Renaissance thought, the classic, scholastic and humanist strains (rev. ed., New York, 1961), pp. 3-23.

⁴See above, note 1(c).

⁵BAV, Vat. lat. 6855, fols. 1^r^v.

⁶J. McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope: funeral oratory from the papal court', Archivum historiae Pontificae, XIV (1976), pp. 9-70; O'Malley, Praise and blame, passim.

⁷See below, pp. 142-7 and passim.

⁸For a discussion of the form and content of Sadoletto's funerary oration, see below, p. 122. For the organisation of the classic epideictic oration, see McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope', pp. 21-22, and ibid., passim, for a discussion on the style and content of a number of papal funerary orations.

⁹Cardinal Bessarion's library is perhaps the most celebrated example. See L. Labowsky, 'Il Cardinale Bessarione e gli inizi della Biblioteca Marciana', Venezia e l'Oriente fra tardo Medio Evo e Rinascimento, ed. A. Pertusi (Venice, 1966), pp. 160-171; *ibid.*, 'Bessarione', *DBI*, Vol. IX (1967), pp. 686-696. For another fifteenth-century cardinal's library, see A. V. Antonovics, 'The library of Cardinal Domenico Capranica', Cultural aspects of the Italian Renaissance: essays in honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller, ed. C. H. Clough (Manchester, 1976), pp. 141-159.

¹⁰'Testamento', fol. [2^v]: 'Item relinquo omnes meos libros in onni [sic] facultate, videlicet in theologia libros, philosophia, canonica et civili librarie quam ibi fabricavi in Santa Maria de pacis ordinis canonicorum regularium pro anima mea'.

¹¹L.E. Boyle, 'Manuscripts and incunabula in the library of San Clemente', *AFP*, XXIX (1959), pp. 206-227, reprinted with additions in San Clemente Miscellany II. Art and archeology; ed. L. Dempsey (Rome, 1978), pp. 152-178.

¹²*Ibid.*, 'Santa Maria della Pace and San Clemente, 1816-1846', San Clemente Miscellany I. The community of SS Sisto e Clemente in Rome, 1677-1977 (Rome, 1977), pp. 89-128. See also the discussion on the history of the Canons Regular at Santa Maria della Pace given in A. Frutaz, 'Inventarium librorum monasterii Pacis de Urbe 1484', Studi in onore di Leopoldo Sandri (Rome, 1983), II, pp. 491-514.

¹³For a more extended discussion of the MS and printed editions that survive from Carafa's bequest to the library of Santa Maria della Pace and a discussion of what their contents reveal about Carafa's intellectual and professional concerns, see D. Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', The Book Collector, XXXVI (1988), pp. 354-371, 471-490.

¹⁴Hermann of Münster could be the scribe 'H. de Monasterio' who signed Vol. III of the 'Fons memorabilium' for Geminiano Inghirami (Biblioteca Laurenziana, cod. laur. aedil. CLXXII). See, A.M. Bandini, Biblioteca Leopoldina Laurentiana (Florence, 1791), I, p. 484.

¹⁵See above, chapter 2, p. 25 and note 18.

¹⁶This scribe also signed in 1478 a copy of Gregory's Dialogues. See Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, MS theol. lat. qu. 58, fol. 132^r. I am grateful to Albinia de la Mare for drawing my attention to this MS.

¹⁷Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', pp. 370-1, cat. nos. 3-4, p. 486, Pls. 7-9.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 471-3, cat. no. 5, p. 486, Pl. 10.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 473-6, cat. nos. 6-10, pp. 486-7.

²⁰Boyle, San Clemente Miscellany, II, p. 162. A MS of orations copied in Greek by Thomas Cantacuzene is cited in R. Foerster (ed.), Libanii opera (Leipzig, 1903), I, 1, pp. 15-16.

²¹Filippo Barbieri, Opuscula (Rome, 1 Dec. 1481), published by Philippus de Lignamine. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19262). See below, chapter 4, note 58, for the concordance between the chapel inscriptions and those given in this work.

²²Augustine (De civitate Dei, XVIII, 23), cites the testimony of the sibyls as true foreknowledge and provides the text of an acrostic poem by the Erythraen Sibyl. See Augustus, Opera (Corpus Christianorum), Vol. XIV, 1-2 (Turnholdt, 1955), pp. 613-15.

²³Barbieri, Opuscula, fol. 2^r: 'quae sane opuscula dicata fuerunt Oliverio Caraffa Neapolitano et Marco barbo sancti Marci cardinalibus: ac Ioanni prothonotario Regis angliae oratori'. As noted above, p. 104, Carafa had close personal contacts with Cardinal Marco Barbo. The third dedicatee is likely to be John Shirwood, Bishop of Durham, English ambassador in Rome and curial client of Cardinal Marco Barbo. See P. S. Allen, 'Bishop Shirwood of Durham and his library', English Historical Review, XXV (1910), pp. 445-456; W. E. Wilkie, The Cardinal Protectors of England (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 12-13, 17-18, 22-24, 41, 55. For Filippo Barbieri, see the entry by S. Zamboni, DBI, VI, pp. 217-221. For further literary patronage of this author by Carafa, see below, p. 115.

²⁴Ex library of San Clemente, Rome. Cajetan, Commentaria super libros Aristotelis de anima [Rome, 1509], fol. 1^v. For a more detailed description of this printed book, see Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', p. 478, cat. no. 3, p. 488. This work is cited in MS form in Florence, S. Marco, Arm. 4, Cod. 31, by J. Quétif and J. Echard (eds.), Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum (Paris, 1723), Vol. II, p. 14. A search for this MS has yielded no result.

²⁵Ex library of San Clemente, Rome. Cajetan, Additiones in libros posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis (Venice, 1505), printed by Simon Lauer for Alexander Calcedonius, fol. 1^v: 'Quando enim ne dicam parem gratiam referrem sed vel numerare quam optata federa pristinem consuetudinis quae maioribus meis tecum: atque cum universa familia tua fuit: et semper inconvulsa permansit patronicia ac favores quos mihi ipsi contulisti ad litterarum gymnasia peregre profiscenti: honorem et dignitatem quibus me inde revocatis: essere ac decorare voluisti tot deinceps quotidianam familiaritatis quae me tibi astringe consilia in agendis rebus maxime opportuna'. For a more detailed description of this presentation edition, see Norman, ibid., p. 479, cat. no. 1, p. 488.

²⁶See P. Madonnet, 'Cajétan', Dictionnaire de théologie catholique (Paris, 1905), II, cols. 1313-1329. For Cajetan's critical bibliography, see M.D. Chenu, 'Cajétan', Bulletin Thomiste, IV (1936), pp. 843-857, and for more recent studies, see O'Malley, Praise and blame, p. 108, n. 123.

²⁷O'Malley, ibid., pp. 17-19.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 16-17, 105-8. The five orations that Cajetan composed are listed in the Appendix, pp. 246-7.

²⁹See above, chapter 2, p. 67.

³⁰Cajetan, Additiones, fol. 1^v.

³¹Aurelio Lippi Brandolino, Oratio pro Sancto Thoma Aquinate [Rome, c. 1485-90], printed by Euch Silber, fols. 1^r, 5^r. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19187). For Brandolino, see the entry by A. Rotondo in the DBI, XIV, pp. 26-8. To his bibliography should be added, C. Trinkaus, In our image and likeness (2 vols., new ed., London, 1970), I, pp. 294-321, II, pp. 601-613; O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 44-50, 113-4. See also the well rehearsed argument against the attribution of this panegyric to Raffaello Brandolino given in O'Malley, 'Some Renaissance panegyrics of Aquinas', Renaissance Quarterly, XXVII (1974), pp. 176-7, n. 12.

³²Cajetan (ed.), Summa sacrae theologiae (Lyons, 1562), preface to Vol. I: 'praesertim cum te me ad hunc cudendam expositionem adhortatus maxime fueris, vixque bene absolutam publicari non solum saepe petieris, verum etiam flagitaveris'. This commentary on Part I of the Summa is dated Rome, 11 May, 1507.

³³O'Malley, 'Some Renaissance panegyrics', p. 178.

³⁴These are:

- a) Aurelius Brandolinus, Oratio, see above, note 31.
- b) Franciscus Maturanzius, 'Oratio habita Romae in aede divae Mariae in Minerva in laudem divi Thomae Aquinatis', BAV, Vat. lat. 5388, fols. 33^v-45^v, dated 1485. O'Malley 'The feast of Thomas Aquinas', p. 11, considers that Carafa almost certainly invited Maturanzius to compose this oration.
- c) Thomas Phaedrus Ingheramus, Panegyricus in memoriam divi Thomae Aquinatis [Rome, after 7 Mar., 1495, 1500], printed by Euch Silber and dedicated to Cardinal Bernardino Carvajal. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19140). Burchard, Liber notarum, I, pp. 578-9, II, p. 207, refers to the two panegyrics delivered by Inghirami on the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas, one on 7 Mar., 1495, the other on 7 Mar., 1500. For Inghirami, see A. Ruggiadi, Tommaso Fedra Inghirami, umanista volterrano, 1470-1516 (Amatrice, 1933).
- d) Martinus de Viana, Oratio . . . in festo divi Thomae de Aquino [Rome, after 7 Mar., 1496], printed by Euch Silber and dedicated to Cardinal di San Giorgio (one of Carafa's executors). The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19016). On fol. 1 the author mentions that Carafa invited him to speak. Burchard, Liber notarum, I, pp. 596-7, refers to this sermon being delivered on 7 Mar., 1496. For Martino de Viana, see O'Malley, ibid., p. 177, n. 15.
- e) Antonius Puccius, 'Oratio de laudibus divi Thomae Aquinat[is] in templo divae Marie Minervae Rome ad patres et populum habita nonis martiis', BAV, Vat. lat. 3465. In the dedication (fol. 2^r), specific reference is made to Carafa's interest in Thomist study. The composition of this oration must have occurred between 1503 (the year of

Carafa's elevation to Cardinal Bishop of Ostia) and 1511 (the year of his death). For a more detailed description of this MS, see below, p. 128.

³⁵See above, note 34.

³⁶The style of the decoration of the commentaries on the Sext is comparable to that of Matteo Felice, an illuminator who worked for the Neapolitan court. For further discussion of the decoration of these two MSS, see Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', pp. 358-365.

³⁷These are:

- a) Antonius Beccadellus, 'Quintum epistolarum volumen', see above, note 1(a).
 - b) Andreas Brentius, 'Oratio funebris Lysiae', see above, note 1(b).
 - c) *Ibid.*, 'Caii Julii Caesaris oratio Belgicae ad milites habita', BAV, Vat. lat. 3551.
 - d) Benedictus Mapheus, 'Epithoma in libros Plinii historiae naturalis', BAV, Vat. lat. 5874.
 - e) Antonius Puccius, 'Oratio de laudibus divi Thom[ae] Aquinat[is]', see above, note 34(e).
 - f) 'Missale', Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Marlay 10.
 - g) Basil, 'Sermo contra ebrios', present whereabouts unknown.
- For further description of these manuscripts, see Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', cat. nos. 1-7, pp. 489-90.

³⁸Brentius, 'Caii Julii Caesaris oratio', and Puccius, 'Oratio'. Both volumes are cited in the inventory of Cardinal Antonio Carafa's library (BAV, Vat. lat. 3553, fols. 16^v-17^r, nos. 25, 26). The relationship of Cardinal Antonio Carafa, one time Cardinal Protector of the Vatican Library, to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa can be traced from the Carafa genealogies given in Litta, Famiglie celebri, tav. XVIII, XIX, XXVIII, XXIX.

³⁹See above, note 37(f), and F. Wormald and P. M. Giles, Exhibition catalogue: illuminated MSS in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge, 1966), no. 103; *ibid.*, A descriptive catalogue of additional illuminated MSS in the Fitzwilliam Museum (2 vols., Cambridge, 1982), I, pp. 70-3. I am grateful to Pamela Robinson for drawing my attention to this MS.

⁴⁰See above, note 1(a).

⁴¹See above, note 37(d), and J. Bignami-Odier, 'Des manuscrits de Prospero Podiani à la Bibliothèque Vaticane', in, Studi di bibliografia e di storia in onore Tammaro de Marinis (Verona, 1964), I, pp. 130-1.

⁴²Brentius, 'Caii Julii Caesaris oratio', fols. 136^r-168^v, see above, note 37(c).

⁴³Brentius, 'Oratio funebris Lysiae', see above, note 1(b).

⁴⁴Basil, 'Sermo contra ebrios', present whereabouts unknown. See B. Quaritch, A Catalogue of illuminated and other MSS (London, 1931), no. 4, illus. folio 1.

⁴⁵In an oral communication with Dr. Albinia de la Mare of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

⁴⁶See above, chapter 2, note 34.

⁴⁷See above, note 34(e).

⁴⁸Newberry Library, Chicago, MS 99.1 (59-2402), Ludovicus de Ferraria O.P., 'Compendium Ethicorum Aristotelis', 79 fols., 26 x 20 cms., paper, full border of olive, green and red acanthus spray, radiating gold discs, written in Italy by a scribe trained in N. Europe after 31 Jan., 1483, unidentified cardinal's arms (fol.1). For a full description of this MS, see the forthcoming catalogue of the Newberry MSS by Paul Saenger. I am grateful to this author for allowing me to read in draft form his entry for this MS.

⁴⁹Ibid., fol. 1^r-2^v. The exact date of this composition is not known but it must postdate 1483 since Carafa is addressed as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina. For Ludovico da Ferrara, see Kaeppli, Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum, III, pp. 92-3; O'Malley, 'The feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas', pp. 12-3.

⁵⁰1) 'Sermo de adventu Christi', in Orationes quinque in cappella pontificia [Rome, n.d., after 1492], fols. [2^r-5^r], for Innocent VIII, 1st Sunday in Advent, yr. unknown.

2) 'Sermo de pugna Christi cum daemone', ibid., fols. [6^r-10^r], for Innocent VIII, 1st Sunday in Lent, 1492?

3) 'Sermo de suprema die', ibid., fols. [10^v-13^v], for Alexander VI, 1st Sunday in Advent, 1492.

4) 'Sermo de divina gratia', ibid., fols. [14^r-16^v], for Alexander VI, 1st Sunday in Lent, yr. unknown.

5) 'Sermo de conformitate ecclesiae militantis ad ecclesiam triumphantem', ibid., fols. [16^v-20^r], for Alexander VI, 1st Sunday in Lent, yr. unknown.

See also O'Malley, 'Preaching for the popes', in The pursuit of holiness eds. C. Trinkaus and H. A. Oberman (Leiden, 1974), pp. 408-440; ibid., Praise and blame, pp. 105-8.

⁵¹Timotheus de Totis, Oratio in funere Ludovico de Ferraria [Rome, after 21 Sept., 1496], printed by Euch Silber, fol. 3^v: 'qz argute docte et eleganter materia[m] illa[m] pertractet: totam etia[m] Aristotelis . . . ethica[m] per Reverendissimo Cardinali p[ro]tecto[re] dignissimo luculenter in capitula clare ac breviter p[er]l[ic]t[ur]a inxit'.

⁵²See Quétif and Echard (eds.), Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum (1719), I, p. 883: 'relinquens post se, commentaria in Aristotelis ethica[m]'.

⁵³British Museum, the Henry Davis Collection, M. 48, Suidas, 'Epistola ad Theodosium Judeorum principem, et eiusdem Theodosii responsio ad eundem Philippum', leather gold-tooled binding, vellum, 8 fols. (another 7 fols. added at a later date), 18.4 x 10 cms., humanist hand, red rubrics. Translated by Francesco Filelfo at the request of Pietro Balbi and Theodore of Gaza and dedicated to the Cardinal of

Naples. I am grateful, to Nicholas Barker of the British Library for drawing my attention to this MS and for Miriam Foot for enabling me to examine it. See also Treasures from private collections in England (London, 1905), no. 68; T. de Marinis, Legatura artistica in Italia (Florence, 1960), I, p.24, no. 209, tav. XXXIII.

⁵⁴Ibid., fol. 1^r/v: 'Reverendissime domine de hac suide translatione cum doctissimo in utraq[ue] lingua viro: domino Theodoro greco quam ubi legisset approbavit: ac[cl]ip[is]se apud mediolanum cum esset Franciscum philelphum Rhetorem inquit eximium transtulisse de greco in latinum. Deinde vero ad Reverendissimum dominum Nicenum ip[s]i nos contulimus eamq[ue]: offendimus et accepto suide vetustissimo codice notam nob[il]issimam] grecam eu[m] latina contulit a principio usq[ue]: in finem & fidelissima translatio inventa est itaq[ue]: non est mirandum si amicus ille eam litteris aureis tanta cu[m] diligentia descripserit.'

⁵⁵See above, note 37(g). The Suidas excerpt falls between fols. 36-44 of this MS. For a discussion of the contents and authorship of this Greek text, see the entry in the New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XIII (1967), p. 783.

⁵⁶Pietro Balbi translated amongst others the works of John Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen. See the entry by A. Pratesi in the DBI, V (1963), pp. 378-9. For Balbi and Filelfo and their study of patristic literature, see C. Stinger, Humanism and the Church Fathers (Albany, N. Y., 1977), pp. 39, 44. For Theodore of Gaza's association with Bessarion, see E. Lee, Sixtus IV and men of letters (Rome, 1978), pp. 173-4.

⁵⁷Diogenes Laertius, Vitae et sententiae philosophorum [Rome, c. 1471-2], printed by Gregorius Lauer and revised by Francesco Elia Marchese from the translation by Ambrogio Traversari. A. Pollard, Catalogue of books in the fifteenth century now in the British Museum, Vol. VII (London, 1935), p. xii, voices a doubt that Lauer was summoned to Rome by Carafa but concedes that Lauer managed the press at Sant'Eusebio. For Traversari's Latin translation and its dedicatory letter where the translator expresses his admiration for the wisdom of the ancients but states that they were unaware of divine truth, see Stinger, ibid., pp. 70-9, esp. p. 76.

⁵⁸Philippus de Barberiis, Discordantia Sanctorum doctorum Hieronymi et Augustini [Naples, c. 1490], printed by Francesco del Tuppo (?), fol. 1^r: 'Sequens hos opusculum Rome impressum est: q[uo]d Reverendissimo Cardinali Neapolitano dicavi s[ecundu]m qu[od]a] impressorum iucio et negligentia plures me[n]dositates com[m]isse sunt: eam ob rem dedi op[er]am ut iteram imprimere[n]t: et per iurum doctum: qui materia[m] intelligeret. See also Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke (Leipzig, 1930), no. 3388.

⁵⁹Early biographers, e.g. Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 299-300; Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, pp. 19-21; Chacón, Vitae et res gestae, cols. 1102-3; give lists of works addressed to Carafa. To these can be added others given by M.E. Cozenza, Biographical and bibliographical dictionary of the Italian humanists (6 vols., Boston,

1962), Supplement (Boston, 1967); P. Kristeller, Iter Italicum (2 vols., London/Leiden, 1963). Apart from the the work of scholars discussed in further detail below, other addresses to Carafa by the following authors can be added:

H. Afarchisius, J. Andrea, J. Bertachinus, H. Bononius, J. Bonus, J. Cabart, J.B. Cantalycius, S. Capycius, J. B. Casalius, A. Celadonius, P. Crinitus, P. Delphinus, J. Facla, P. Feltrus, A. Guarinus, C. Maphaeus, R. de Montaurus, J. Sabidinus.

⁶⁰Cortesius, De cardinalitu, Liber II, cap. 3, 'De familia cardinalis', esp. fol. 56^r, where he specifically praises Carafa for his choice of Giovanni Battista Almadiano as a member of his household. See also D'Amico, Humanism in Rome, pp. 52-6.

⁶¹Vida, Epicedion, fol. 7^r.

⁶²Brentius, 'Oratio in convivii', fols. 29^{r/v}.

⁶³See above, chapter 2, p. 31. For Brenta, see M. Miglio's entry in DBI, XIV, pp. 149-151.

⁶⁴BAV, Vat. lat. 3964, fols. 10^v, 11^r, 18^r. Published in M. Bertola, I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Codici latini Vaticani 3964, 3966), (Città del Vaticano, 1942), pp. 11, 12, 18. Brenta borrowed copies of Xenophon's Anabasis, Aristotle's De caelo and an unspecified work by Hippocrates. Another entry, dated 28 August, 1481 (*ibid.*, fol. 22^v), identifies the borrower as Lorenzo Lucense, scutifer (herald), to the Cardinal of Naples.

⁶⁵Andreas Brentius, De natura hominis et alia opuscula [Rome, c. 1482-3], printed by Euch Silber, fol. 2^r: '[Clum in exequilinam [sic] habitione[m] Olivieri Cardinalis Neapolitani principis mei locum saluberrimu[m], et] amoenissimum ab urbis frequentia propter pestile[n]s anni tempus secessissem'. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19203). The translation of Hippocrates' Lex medicinae, fols. 15^v-17^r, is dedicated to Oliviero Carafa. G. L. Marini, Degli architrici pontifici (Rome, 1784), I, p. 215, suggests that here Brenta is making a reference to the outbreak of plague that occurred in Rome in 1476.

⁶⁶Schrader, Monumentorum Italiae, p. 218. The sources for these epigrams and their significance will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 6, pp. 357-8.

⁶⁷Bertola, I due registri, p. 11 (Vat. lat. 3964, fol. 10^v): 'Andreas Brentius Patavinus reverendissimi d[omi]ni Neapolitani familiaris habuit] comodo Anakvasim Cyri, ex Senophonte [sic] pridie kalendas iulias ut ex eius scripto apparet'.

⁶⁸Brentius, 'Caii Julii Caesaris oratio'. See also Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', cat. no. 1, p. 489.

⁶⁹These include two letters from Caesar to Cicero (fol. 22^{r/v}) and epistolatory compositions by Petrarch (fol. 69^v) and Leonardo Bruni

(fol. 99^r). One oration was transcribed according to the rubric from another document emended by Antonio Carafa. Exerpts from Isidore of Seville's Etymologia and Cyriaco d'Ancona's account of the seven wonders of the world (fols. 135^v-165^r) are also included in this miscellany.

⁷⁰Brentius, 'Oratio funebris Lysiae; oratio in convivii laudem habita apud Cardinalem Oliverium Neapolitanum; oratio S. Joannis Chrysostomi in proditionem Judae; lex medicinae Hippocratis'. See also Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', cat. no. 2, p. 489.

⁷¹Brentius, 'Oratio funebris Lysiae', fol. 4^r^v.

⁷²Ibid., 'Oratio ...Cardinalem Oliverium Neapolitanum', fol. 29^r: 'quale quidem sedes tibi omnium opinione referuatur'. This oration in praise of Oliviero Carafa is dedicated to Alessandro Carafa and dated 15 March, 1477 (fols. 24^r-25^r).

⁷³BAV, Vat. lat. 3681, 'Hippocratis libellus de insomniis, Andrea Brentio interprete'.

⁷⁴See above, note 65.

⁷⁵Bertola, I registri, p. 18 (Vat. lat. 3964, fol. 18^r): 'Ego Andreas Brenius Patavinus, Cardinalis Neap[olitanus] familiaris, fateor me mutuo accepisse a domino Platyna Hippocratis opera, restitutum ad beneplacitum suum, die xxi iunii 1479 [in margin] Restituit 1111^o idus iunias 1480'.

⁷⁶Brentius, 'Lex medicinae Hippocratis', fol. 53^r: 'Oliveri princeps optime . . . oratores sive iurisco[n]sulti sive dialecti & phil[osophi] & medici officia[n]tur'.

⁷⁷Andreas Brentius, In pentecosten oratio [Rome, after 18 May, 1483], printed by Euch Silber. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 18817). There is a surviving MS copy of this oration with its dedication to Oliviero, Cardinal of Naples, in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, cod. 89 sup. cart. misc. XV, fols. 333^v-342^v. Jacopo Gherardi, Diario concistoriale, p. 118, refers to Brenta preaching this sermon, but his only memory of it was Brenta lecturing his audience on the correct spelling of the Paraclete.

⁷⁸O'Malley, Praise and blame, p. 40, thus gives an apt designation - 'dogmatic oratory'.

⁷⁹Brentius, In pentecosten oratio, fol. [1^v]: 'cum mihi studiorum ocium suppedites ac bene vivendi ratio[n]e[m] singulari virtutu[m] tuarum exemplo demonstres'.

⁸⁰Ibid., fol. [2^v].

⁸¹Ibid., fol. [9^r^v]: 'Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus Sanctus. Non est illic ulla discordia, non est velli vicissitudo. Omnes idem sentiunt, una omnium praecognito . . . ex quo terrestrium caelestiumque rerum harmonia constititur'.

⁸²Douglas, Jacopo Sadoletto, pp. 5, 7-12.

⁸³Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Archivio di Castel Sant'Angelo, AA I-XVIII, 6541, fol. 173v: 'Qui [Sadoletus] vestre nobilissimae familiae alumnus, et in castissima Oliverij Carrafe Card[inalis] dom[in]io, iam inde ad adolescentia tecum educatus; quicquid unquam honoris, nominis celebratatis, doctrine denique ac virtutis adeptus est: id rectis familiae vestre institutis acceptum retulit'. Cited in R. de Maio, Alfonso Carafa: Cardinale di Napoli (1540-1565) (Città del Vaticano, 1961), p. 1, n. 3.

⁸⁴Sadoletus, 'Oratio funebris', fol. 408r, refers to Carafa's art patronage thus: 'Declarant hoc aedes suburbanae, pluribusque locis constructa aedificia, sed egregie ac insigniter templa ac delubra divorum immortalium, tum Romae condita, tum Neapoli: in quibus ita magnificus extitit, ut in iis numum aureum summa ad octuages millies in sumptum fecisse dicatur'.

⁸⁵For a discussion of the formal differences of these two types of literary composition, see McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope', pp. 21-3, 24-5; O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 36-44.

⁸⁶BAV, Vat. lat. 8927, Iacobi Sadoleti de bello suscipiendo contra Turcas ad Ludovicum regem Galliarum oratio, 46 fols. This printed treatise has as its frontispiece an autograph letter by Sadoletto addressed to 'Ol[iverius] Car[dinalis] Neapolitanus'.

⁸⁷Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Perugia, Fondo Vecchio, G 102, 'Aristotelis ad Alexandrum de mundo liber', fols. 3v-23r, translated by Iacopus Sadoletus with a preface dedicated to Oliverius Carapha Card[inalis], cited by Kristeller, Iter Italicum, II, p. 57.

⁸⁸See A. Galletti, L'eloquenza (Milan, 1904-38), pp. 590-2; C. Trinkaus, Adversity's noblemen: the Italian humanists on happiness (2nd ed., New York, 1965), esp. pp. 128-140; McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope', p. 45; O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 190-1, 232-5.

⁸⁹See above, note 83 and chapter 2, note 148.

⁹⁰British Library, Add. MS 8443, Paris de Grassis, 'Diarium', fol. 214v... The precise circumstances of this incident will be discussed in further detail below, pp. 142-3.

⁹¹For Pietro Bembo and Federigo Fregoso, see Douglas, Jacopo Sadoletto, p. 12. For Giovanni Battista Almadiano, a friend of Platina and member of the Neapolitan Academy Pontaniana, see Cortesius, De cardinalitu, Liber II, cap. 3, fol. 56r; Cosenza, Dictionary of Italian humanists, I, p. 142. Almadiano is also referred to as Carafa's secretary by Matteo Bandello in the dedication of his 19th novella, see Novelle di Matteo Bandello, ed. G. Silvestri (Milan, 1813), parte prima, II, p. 16.

⁹²G. Resta (ed.) L'epistolario del Panormita (Messina, 1954), esp. pp. 38-9, 46-7, 157-8. See also above, note 1(a).

⁹³BAV, Vat. lat. 3611, 'Antonii Geraldini liber carminum', 23 fols. The 17th ode is dedicated to Carafa as Cardinal of Naples and Cardinal Presbyter of SS Pietro e Marcellino (fols. 16^r✓). Other odes are addressed to Paul II, Cardinals Bessarion, d'Estouteville, Latino Orsini, Marco Barbo, Francesco Piccolomini and Francesco Gonzaga. They were first published in B. Geraldini, Antonio Geraldini Amerini protonotarii apostolici ac poetae laureati: specimum carminum (Emilia, 1893). For a brief biography of Antonio Geraldini, see W. P. Mustard (ed.) The eclogues of Antonio Geraldini (Baltimore, 1924), pp. 11-16.

⁹⁴BAV, Ottob. lat. 2011, 'Franciscus Maturantius Carmina', 110 fols. The ode to Carafa occurs on fol. 45^r✓. It is of interest that Francesco Maturanzio was also the author of one of the eight surviving orations written in honour of Saint Thomas Aquinas (see above, note 34(b)).

⁹⁵BAV, Vat. lat. 2870, 'Flaminii Carmina', 61 fols. The eight epigrams dedicated to the Cardinal of Naples occur on fols. 44^r-46^v. At the foot of fol. 45^r one of these epigrams is partially cancelled and reappears in a slightly revised form on fol. 45^v. All eight have been published in Reynolds, 'Private and public emblems', p. 275. She (*ibid.*, p. 275, n.16), is, however, incorrect to cite C. Maddison, Marcantonio Flaminio: poet, humanist and reformer (London, 1965), as biographical source for the author of the poems in Vat. lat. 2870. For biographical details of the correct Antonio Flaminio, see M. Vattasso, Antonio Flaminio e le principali poese dell'autografo Vaticano 2870 (Rome, 1900).

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, fols. 44^v-45^r. Reynolds, 'Private and public emblems', p. 276.

⁹⁷Biblia latina (with commentaries by Nicolaus de Lyra et. al.), (Venice, 8 Aug., 1489), printed by Bonetus Locatellus for Octavianus Scotus, 'Secundum Lucam' (10:25-28): 'Et ecce, quidam legis peritus surrexit tentans [*sic*] illum et dice[n]s. Magister quid faciendo vitam [a]eternam possidebo. Et ille dixit ad eum. In lege quid scriptum est? Quomodo legis? Ille respondens dixit. Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo et ex tota ani[m]a tua. Et ex omnibus viribus tuis. Et ex omne mente tua, et proximam tuam sicut te ipsum. Dixitque illi recte respondisti. Hoc fac et vives'. The text is cited from a copy once owned by Santa Maria della Pace and acquired by the Dominicans of San Clemente. There is therefore the possibility that it once belonged to Carafa himself. For Saint Ambrose's gloss on this passage, see 'Sancti Ambrosii Expositionis in Lucam, Liber VII', in J. P. Migne (ed.) Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina (Paris, 1887), Vol. XV, col. 1805.

⁹⁸BAV, Vat. lat. 3463, 'Hieronymi Donati de principatu Romanae Sedis ad Graecos', 20 fols. This MS is prefaced by a letter dated October, 1555, to Cardinal Carlo Carafa from Filippo Donati who had edited this work composed by his father, Girolamo.

⁹⁹Johannes Baptista Mantuanus, De calamitatibus suorum temporum (Venice, 10 Sept., 1499), printed by Jacobus de Leoco. The edition used

is the British Library copy (IA 24533). See also Trinkaus, Adversity's noblemen, pp. 128-9.

¹⁰⁰For the biography of Giovanni Baptista Spagnuoli, see W. P. Mustard, The eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus (Baltimore, 1911), p. 15, n.16. For his official contacts with Carafa, see de Maio, Savonarola, p. 128, n.33. Kristeller, Iter Italicum, II, p. 162, lists a poem of Spagnuoli dedicated to Oliviero Carafa Card[inalis] (Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, E IV).

¹⁰¹Augustinus Niphus, De nostrarum calamitatum causis (Venice, April, 1505), printed by Bonetus Locatellus for Octavianus Scotus. The edition used is the Vatican Library copy (RI II 89 int. 3). See also Trinkaus, Adversity's noblemen, pp. 132-4. Kristeller, ibid., I, p. 417, cites a MS copy of a poem by Nifo dedicated to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, 53 cart. misc. XVI-XVIII, fol. 109v).

¹⁰²Benedictus Mapheus, De laudibus pacis oratio [Rome, after 13 Aug., 1483], published by Stephanus Plannck(?). The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 18325).

¹⁰³Ibid., 'Epithoma in libros Plinii historiae naturalis', see above, note 37(d) and Norman, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', cat. no. 3, p. 489. Benedetto Maffei (d. 1494) was a papal abbreviator. In the sixteenth century, members of his family achieved even higher positions in the Roman Curia; an example of the growing power and influence of laymen in the papal administration. See S. Maffei, Verona illustrata (Milan, 1825) pt. 2, pp. 261-3; D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 220, 265, n.36, and ibid., pp. 70-88, for an account of a number of other clerical dynasties.

¹⁰⁴The sources and record of these inscriptions will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 6, p. 357. See also above p. 117, for Andrea Brenta's probable contribution to this villa's programme of epigraphy.

¹⁰⁵Ioannis Picus Mirandola, Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatoricam, ed. E. Garin (2 vols., Florence, 1946-52). The dedication reads: 'Ioannes Franciscus Picus Mirandula sacratissimo patri Oliverio Carafa, Episcopo Sabiensi cardinalique Neapolitano'.

¹⁰⁶See above, pp. 106-111.

¹⁰⁷Ludovicus de Ferraria, 'Compendium'. See above, note 48.

¹⁰⁸See below, chapter 8, pp. 421-6.

¹⁰⁹See above, notes 28 and 50.

¹¹⁰Schömberg was one of the witnesses of Carafa's will, see above, chapter 2, p. 67 and note 128. Timotheo de Totis refers in fulsome terms to Carafa's abilities as Cardinal Protector in his funeral oration to Ludovico da Ferrara. See above, note 51.

¹¹¹Masuccio Salernitano, Il novellino, in Scrittori d'Italia, ed. E. Mauro (Bari, 1940), Vol. CLXXIII, Novella XVII, pp. 153-4

¹¹²The following only represent a sample of the extensive literature beginning in the sixteenth century on Pasquino and the statue's literary associations: U. Aldovrandi, Delle statue antiche, in L. Mauro, L'antichità della città di Roma (Venice, 1562), p. 132; A. Fulvio, L'antichità di Roma (Venice, 1588), p. 315^{r/v}; F. Martinelli, Roma ricercata nel suo sito & nella scuola di tutti gli antiquarii (Rome, 1658), pp. 125-6; F. Cancellieri, Notizie delle due famose statue di un fiume e di un fiume e di Patroclo dette volgarmente di Pasquino e Marforio (Rome, n. ed., 1854); D. Gnoli, 'Le origini di Maestro Pasquino', in Nuova antologia, XXV, 3 (1890); *ibid.*, La Roma di Leon X, ed. A. Gnoli (Milan, 1938), pp. 164-184, 300-8; W. Brachmann, 'Ajax oder Menelaus? Beitrag zur Würdigung der Pasquino Gruppe', Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, XLII (1922), cols. 786-792; B. Schweitzer, 'Die Menelaos-Patroklos-Gruppe. Eine verlorenes meisterwerk Hellenistischer Kunst', Die Antike, XIV (1938), pp. 43-72; R. & F. Silenzi (eds.), Pasquino. Cinquecento pasquinate (Milan, 1932); F. Haskell and N. Penny, Taste and the antique: the lure of classical sculpture (Newhaven and London, 1981), cat. no. 72, pp. 291-6; V. Marucci, A. Marzo, A. Romano, Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento (2 vols., Rome, 1983); P. Pray Bober and R. Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture: a handbook of sources (Oxford, 1986), cat. no. 155, p. 187.

¹¹³Reynolds, 'Carafa and Pasquino', esp. pp. 184-208.

¹¹⁴This palace will be discussed in some detail below, chapter 6, pp. 359-66. Burchard, Liber notarum, I, p. 271, II, p. 450, records that the Cardinal of Naples' palace was situated on this processional route.

¹¹⁵Schrader, Monumentorum Italiae, p. 219: 'Oliverij Carafae beneficio hic sum. Anno salutis M.D.I.'. R. Lanciani, Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità (Rome, 1902), I, p. 106, makes an interesting but unsubstantiated suggestion that this statue was discovered in 1501 during the building of Carafa's cloister at the nearby site of Santa Maria della Pace.

¹¹⁶Based on the episode in the Iliad, Book XVII. For a summary of the current views on the identification and dating of the various surviving copies of this group, see W. Helbig, Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom (Tubingen, 1963), I, pp. 126-8; M. Bieber, The sculpture of the Hellenistic age (new ed., New York, 1961), pp. 78-9.

¹¹⁷Stanza 111. Published in G. Govi, 'Intorno a un opuscolo rarissimo della fine del secolo XV intitolato: "Antiquarie prospettiche romane composte per prospettivo Milanese dipintore"', Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, III (1876), part 3 (Memorie), pp. 3-30.

¹¹⁸Burchard, Liber notarum, II, p. 296.

¹¹⁹Silenzi, Cinquecento pasquinate, pp. 22, 23, 24, 54. See also the 'Raccolta di pasquinate', ibid., pp. 197-317, which record pasquinades written up until 1870. For vernacular pasquinades written between 1509 and 1566, see Marucci et al., Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento, passim.

¹²⁰Carmina quae ad pasquillum fuerunt posita in anno M.CCCCC.IX (Rome, 1509). The text cited is from the British Library copy (11409 g.22). Jacopo Mazzochi is assumed to be the printer of this early edition of pasquinades.

¹²¹Ibid., fols. 2^v-3^r. The text of the early Carmina is corrupt and without formal pagination. I have therefore adopted Reynolds' mode of pagination, i.e. the frontispiece (missing in the British library copy of the 1509 edition), as folio 1 and the first page of text as folio 2.

¹²²Gnoli, 'Le origini', p. 9; Reynolds, 'Carafa and Pasquino', pp. 189-190.

¹²³Carmina (1509), fol. [3^r]: 'Et cu[m] septimo cale[n]das Maii, festo divi Marci Evangelistae, sedile quod ex lapide ad ipsam statua[m] est ex ornari aulaeis vel Attalicis vestibis sit solitum, q[uod] in eode[m] more sacerdotes Sanctii Laurentii in damaso co[n]sideant, aliqua[n]tis per coepta est & ipsa statua simul exornari, & poni versus aliquot ad illum primulu[m] coeperunt, & varifale ei putoru[m] opera formae fueru[n]t induct[ae], alinquo ex clie[n]tibus Card[inalis] Neapo[litanu] viro docto inveniente & mercedem pictori Car[dinalis] persolvente in annos versuu[m] numerus crevit. Hoc aut[em] a[n]no, quo Jani forma fuit illi inducta, circiter tria millia ad illum fuerunt posita'.

¹²⁴Ibid., fol. [3^v]: 'Dextra baculum sinistra vero clavem gerebat q[ue] liminum ac ianarium quae ab illo dictae sunt custos esset & utrunq[ue] ad custodem spectat. Baculo enim repellit clavi autem ostium aperit ac claudit: iuxta illum illum quadrata figura colore candido ac pate[n]tibus foribus templum erat'.

¹²⁵Reynolds, 'Carafa and Pasquino', p. 193.

¹²⁶See below, chapter 5, pp. 306-7, 313-4, for a more extended discussion of the iconographic significance of the Janus weight.

¹²⁷Carmina (1509), fol. [3^r^v].

¹²⁸Ibid., fol. [5^r]. In Silenzi, Pasquino cinquecento pasquinate, Polius is described as an 'insegnante di cosmografia e di geografia nell'Università e grande amico del Carafa'. See also Gnoli, 'Le origini', pp. 17-8.

¹²⁹Carafa's protégés, Andrea Brenta and Cajetan both lectured at the Studio Romano. For this institution, see D. S. Chambers, 'Studium Urbis and Gabella Studii: the University of Rome in the fifteenth century', in Clough (ed.), Cultural aspects of the Italian Renaissance, pp. 68-110.

¹³⁰Burchard, Liber notarum, II, p. 21. See also ibid., II, pp. 101, 232, 269, 286, 328, for cardinals taking responsibility for decorating the streets of the processional route with ornamental hangings.

¹³¹Gnoli, 'Le origini', pp. 25-8, ibid., 'Orti letterari nella Roma di Leon X', in La Roma di Leon X, pp. 136-163; P. Pray Bober, 'The Coryciana and the nymph Corycia', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XL (1977), pp. 223-239; V.A. Bonito, 'The Saint Anne altar in Sant'Agostino: a new discovery', Burlington Magazine, CXXII (1980), pp. 805-12; ibid., 'The Saint Anne altar in Sant'Agostino, restoration and interpretation', Burlington Magazine, CCXIV (1982), pp. 268-276; D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 108-9; Reynolds, 'Carafa and Pasquino', pp. 186-8, 190-2.

¹³²See above, p. 117, and below, chapter 6, p. 357.

¹³³Burchard, Liber notarum, II, p. 448.

¹³⁴Carmina (1509), fols. [5^r, 10^v, 15^r, 17^v, 18^r].

¹³⁵Ibid., fols. [5^r, 8^{r/v}, 10^r, 12^v, 17^v].

¹³⁶Ibid., fols. [11^v -12^r, 14^v].

¹³⁷Carmina ad Pasquillum Herculem obtruncantem Hydram referentem posita anno M.D.X. (Rome, 1510), printed by Jacopo Mazzochi. The text cited is from the British library copy (11403 bb.58)

¹³⁸Ibid., fol. [2^r].

¹³⁹Ibid., fol. [2^v]: 'fuerunt ad me missa'.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., fol. [2^{r/v}]: 'Postremo, quod epigrammata erant, nec quidam pauca, quae utpote a pueris composita, praeter syllabarum peccata, sensus imperfectos aut parum expressos continerent. Horu[m] audacia[m] atq[ue] ingenium est laudand[um], cohortand[um]q[ue], ac excitandi sunt ad studia litteraru[m]'.
.

¹⁴¹References to other deities, ibid., fols. [5^r, 8^r, 9^r], imply that the transformation of the statue into Hercules was one of a series of transformations beginning well before this printed edition of the Carmina.

¹⁴²Ibid., fol. [4^r].

¹⁴³Ibid., fol. [3^v].

¹⁴⁴Carmina ad Pasquillum posita M.D.XI (Rome, 7 May, 1511), printed by Jacopo Mazzochi. The text cited is from the Cambridge University Library copy (F.151 c.2.5).

¹⁴⁵There are a number of other early representations of Pasquino. A page of a sketchbook by Francesco Hollanda (now in the Escorial) shows Pasquino/Menelaus in a helmet on which is inscribed a detail of a

soldier and horse in combat. See the facsimile edition, Os desenhos das antigualhas que vio Francisco d'Ollanda, pintor português, ed. E. Tormo (Madrid, 1940), fol. 18^r. There is also Lafréry's celebrated print of Pasquino with pasquinades pinned to the base and adjacent wall of the statue (Pl. 12). Another version of this print was made with the pasquinades removed. There also survives another sixteenth-century engraving and two crude woodcuts (either late sixteenth century or early seventeenth century, reproduced in Marucci (ed.), Pasquinate del Cinquecento, I, tav., ii-iv; II, xxvi-xxvii).

¹⁴⁶Carmina (1511), fol. [1^v].

¹⁴⁷Ibid., fol. [2^r]: 'Quae vos nutrierat collegia sacra Minerva/
Fovit & assidue, pinguis oliva iacet.'

¹⁴⁸Ibid., fol. [20^r]: 'Piango l'Italia & gia persa fede/ vedendo il
turcho che vien adar soma/ ea submetter noi di Christo herede'.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., fol. [6^v]: 'Debueras triplici frontem redimire tiara'.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., fol. [18^v]: 'Piango infelice poi che son privato/ Del mio
degn signor napolitano'.

¹⁵¹Gnoli, 'Le origini', pp. 164-184, 300-8; Chambers, Cardinal Bainbridge, pp. 112-5, 120-5; Haskell and Penny, Taste and the antique, p. 291.

¹⁵²Reynolds, 'Carafa and Pasquino', p. 207.

¹⁵³Demetrio Calcondila himself refers to the Archbishop of Naples (i.e. Carafa) in a letter written in 1472 and addressed to Giovanni Lorenzi. In this letter he states that he had decided not to enter into the service of the Archbishop's cousin. The letter written in Greek is published in H. Noiret, 'Huit lettres inédites de Démétrius Chalcondyle', Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, VII (1887), pp. 490-3, esp. p. 493.

¹⁵⁴See above, note 54.

¹⁵⁵For the survival of Greek language and scholarship in southern Italy in the Middle Ages under the aegis of Basilian monasticism, see R. Weiss, 'The Greek culture of South Italy in the later Middle Ages', Proceedings of the British Academy, XXXVII (1951), pp. 23-50; K. M. Setton, 'The Byzantine background to the Italian Renaissance', Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, C (1956), pp. 1-76, *passim*. For the interest taken by fourteenth and fifteenth-century Aragonese kings in Greek scholarship, see *ibid.*, pp. 64-9; E. Gothein, Die Culturenwicklung Sud-Italiens (Breslau, 1886), *passim*; Altamura, L'umanesimo nel mezzogiorno, pp. 132-152; J. H. Bentley, Politics and culture in Renaissance Naples, Princeton, 1987, pp. 40, 54-5.

¹⁵⁶D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, pp. 170-1; Stinger, The Renaissance in Rome, pp. 233-4.

¹⁵⁷'Epistola ad Theodosium . . . et Theodosii responsio', fols. 5^v-6^r. The crucial passage ends: 'Maria autem respondens vere aut ego eum pefrlpetfuli inscia in terra de patre ei sed ab angelo audiui esse filiu[m] dei: filius est ergo mei in utelrum] Marie virginis et filius dei'.

¹⁵⁸See above, pp. 105-6. The relevant passages on the divine and human nature in the one person of Jesus Christ occur in the Divinae Institutiones, Book IV, section 8. For an informative summary of the reasons for Lactantius' concentration upon the doctrine of the Incarnation and Hypostatic Union at the expense of the Trinity, see the editorial notes in M. F. McDonald (trans.) The Divine Institutes (Washington, 1964), pp. 258-9. For further discussion of the significance of Carafa's familiarity with this passage in Lactantius, see below chapter 4, pp. 183, 228.

¹⁵⁹O'Malley, 'Preaching for the popes', p. 417 and passim; see also his illuminating remarks as regards this bias in Praise and blame, pp. 138-151.

¹⁶⁰This topic of debate will be expanded upon below, chapter 4, pp. 190-1, 228.

¹⁶¹O'Malley, Praise and blame, pp. 22, 25, 200. Cardinals Carafa and Piccolomini were both appointed to Alexander VI's reform commission, and they both acted as executors to Cardinal Marco Barbo; Carafa played a prominent role in enabling the conclave that elected Piccolomini as Pope Pius III, to be held. See above chapter 2, pp. 64, 40.

¹⁶²See above, chapter 2, p. 77 and note 158. Paris de Grassis in his 'Clalerimoniaru[m] regularum supplementu[m] et additiones' (BAV Vat. lat. 5634 bis), fols. 318^v-320^r, gives a clear indication of Carafa's promotion of the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas as part of the liturgies of the papal chapel. See below, chapter 4, p. 251.

¹⁶³Of the authors of sacred sermons listed by O'Malley, Praise and blame, appendix, pp. 245-255, the following had contacts with Carafa, either through his association with their religious orders and/or by dedicating their scholarly work to him: Baptista Mantuanus, Aurelio 'Lippo' Brandolino, Andrea Brenta, Cajetan (5), Pietro Gravina, Tommaso 'Fedra' Inghirami, Lodovico da Ferrara (5), Nicolaus Schömborg (5), Raynaldus Mons Aureus, Hieronymus Sceptius, Timotheo de Totis (2), Martinus de Viana. To these can be added the sermon of Marcus Antonius Magnus. See below, note 164.

¹⁶⁴See above, note 90. The circumstances in which this sermon was written is also alluded to by Magnus in his prefatory letter to Oliviero Carafa and in the body of the text, 'Oratio de Spiritu Sancto', Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Cod. lat. XI. 85 (4194), fols. 1^r, 3^r-4^v.

¹⁶⁵See above, p. 110.

¹⁶⁶See McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope', passim.

¹⁶⁷Brandolinus, Oratio pro Sancto Thoma Aquinate, fols. 11^r-12^v; Ingheramus, Panegyricus S. Thomae Aquinatis, fol. 6^v; Baptista Mantuanus, 'Oratio in omnium Sanctorum celebritate', Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, cod. II, 162, fols. 130^r-142^r, esp. fols. 141^v-142^r, offer similar criticism of the evils of the day.

¹⁶⁸O'Malley, Praise and blame, p. 194.

¹⁶⁹See above, pp. 122-3, 126-7.

¹⁷⁰Ingheramus, Panegyricus, fols. 4^v-5^r: 'Beati felicesque sunt igitur illi qui prudenter, iuste, fortiter, temperate administrant omnia. Beatores felicioresque tamen illi qui in rerum naturalium indagatione caelestiumque contemplatione versantur. Illi vero beatissimi felicissimque et supra hominem appellandi qui utramque vitam sic tenuerint, in utraque sic se execuerint ut cui potissimum adhaeserint cognitu sit difficillimum'.

¹⁷¹De Viana, Oratio in festo divi Thomae de Aquino, fols. 5^r/^v.

¹⁷²Ludovicus de Ferraria, 'Sermo de suprema die', in Orationes quinque, fol. [13^r]: 'Inde clarissimam lucem, immortalem vitam, incredibilem levitatem corpus accipiet. Ardeo equidem omnem eorum felicitatem explicare, sed me conantem superat rei magnitudo tantum ergo vos admonuisse liceat: ponite ante oculos praeclarum hoc et insigne spectaculum'.

¹⁷³Petrus Gravina, Oratio de Christi ad caelos ascensu [Rome, 1493], printed by Stephanus Plannck. It seems highly probable that Gravina composed two epitaphs (now lost) for Carafa's chapel of the Succorpo in Naples. See below chapter 5, pp. 310-311. For Gravina, see Cozenza, Dictionary of the Italian humanists, II, pp. 1671-2.

¹⁷⁴Ingheramus, Panegyricus, fol. [2^r]: 'eorum memoria veluti pictura egregia, sed vetustate evanescens, novis quasi coloribus annua laudatione renovaretur'.

¹⁷⁵Ludovicus de Ferraria, 'De conformitate ecclesiae militantis ad ecclesiam triumphantem', in Orationes quinque, fol. [19^r].

¹⁷⁶'Oratio de eligendo Summo Pontifice', see McManamon, 'The ideal Renaissance pope', pp. 16, n.42, 29-30, 32.

¹⁷⁷A point argued very cogently by Paul Kristeller, 'Humanism and scholasticism', in Renaissance thought, pp. 92-107.

¹⁷⁸Douglas, Jacopo Sadoleto, p. 8.

¹⁷⁹D'Amico, Humanism in papal Rome, *passim*, has pointed out recently that in Renaissance Rome there was an increased interest shown by humanists in theology. This arose in part from their professional interests as clerics, curialists and members of ecclesiastical households but also as a result of a general intellectual trend towards accomodating humanism within a Christian context. The varied approaches

towards such an initiative are demonstrated by this author's shrewd analysis (*ibid.*, pp. 148-211), of Cortese's Liber sententiarum, Adriano Castellesi's, De vera philosophia (1507), and Raffael Maffei's, De Institutione Christiana (1518) and Stromata (c.1519-20).

CHAPTER IV

The Carafa chapel at Santa Maria sopra Minerva

The Carafa chapel is located at the end of the south transept of the Roman church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Pl. 14).¹ Over the entrance arch is an inscription in fine humanist lettering which proclaims boldly the dedication of the chapel to the Virgin Annunciate - the Annunziata - and Saint Thomas Aquinas.² On the keystone, in the form of a scroll, is another inscription naming Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal of Naples, the creator of the chapel (Pl. 15).³ The three persons named on the entrance arch thus account for the principal subject matter of the mural paintings in the chapel (Pl. 16). In the fresco altarpiece, the Virgin Mary is portrayed with Gabriel at the moment of the Annunciation and thus as Maria Annunziata. Saint Thomas Aquinas and Cardinal Oliviero Carafa are shown in attendance upon her (Pl. 17). The Virgin is further honoured by the depiction of her assumption into heaven on the altar wall (Pls. 14, 18) and by the sibyls in the vault (Pl. 19), each of whom displays an inscription relating to the Virgin's role in the miracle of the Incarnation. On the west wall are two more paintings which commemorate aspects of Thomas Aquinas' sanctity (Pls. 20, 21).

Below these two paintings is a tablet decorated with Carafa's personal imprese (Pls. 16, 22). It records a papal bull, dated 14 June, 1493, and promulgated by Alexander VI. From it one learns that Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, had founded the chapel of the Annunziata and Saint Thomas Aquinas in the church of the Virgin super

Minervam and had both embellished and endowed this chapel. Furthermore a plenary indulgence had been granted to all who visited the chapel on the feasts of the Birth of the Virgin and Saint Thomas Aquinas.⁴

Apart from this early record of the chapel's history located inside the chapel itself, a number of other contemporary written sources allude to it. From March, 1493, until March, 1504, Burchard makes ten separate references in his Liber notarum to the Cardinal of Naples' chapel and relates how it featured in the liturgies of the papal chapel on the feasts of the Annunciation, Birth of the Virgin and Saint Thomas Aquinas.⁵ Burchard was, however, concerned principally with matters of liturgical protocol and therefore made no allusion to the painted decoration of the chapel. His successor, Paris de Grassis, in a supplement to his revision of the Ceremoniale (the principal record of the religious ceremonial of the papal court), while discussing the feast of Thomas Aquinas refers to Oliviero Carafa's promotion of this feast and to his chapel 'built in a noteworthy and graceful style in honour of God'.⁶ Cortese, in De cardinalatu, further commends the ingenious and erudite 'argument' of the paintings in the Cardinal of Naples' chapel.⁷ A year earlier, in 1510, Francesco Albertini, in his guide book to Rome, provides the first acknowledgement of the painter's part in the chapel by naming a fellow Florentine, Filippino Lippi, its creator. This author also makes a significant connection between the paintings in this chapel and those by Filippino in the Strozzi chapel in Santa Maria Novella, Florence.⁸ Leandro Alberti in his chronicle of famous Dominicans (1517), gives fulsome acknowledgement of Carafa's act of benevolent patronage towards the principal Dominican church in Rome.⁹

It is Vasari, however, who provides the most extensive of the early descriptions of the Carafa chapel. In the 1550 edition of the Lives, in his biographical account of Filippino Lippi, he states that due to the friendship between the painter and Lorenzo de' Medici, Filippino was requested to go to Rome to execute a very great work for Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal of Naples. En route to Rome, he designed (again at Lorenzo's behest) a tomb monument for his father, Filippo Lippi, in the Duomo of Spoleto. In Rome, he painted a chapel in the church of the Minerva with istorie of Saint Thomas Aquinas and other Christian poesie which were highly praised. He returned to Florence and began Filippo Strozzi's chapel in Santa Maria Novella but, after completing the vault, he returned to Rome to embellish, with stucco and plaster, a tomb chamber in 'una cappellina' beside the main chapel. Much of the work on the latter project was by Filippino's assistant, Raffaellino del Garbo. The paintings for the chapel proper were valued by two local painters at two thousand ducats, over and above the cost of the ultramarine pigment and the wages of Filippino's assistants. When the work was finished the painter returned to Florence and completed the Strozzi chapel.¹⁰

In the 1568 edition of the Lives, Vasari retains from his earlier account the essential information on the history of the commission but elaborates somewhat upon the subject matter of the paintings. He begins by describing some very beautiful 'poesie' which depict Faith and Hope taking prisoner respectively Infidelity and Despair, together with other Virtues subjecting Vices. Next he refers to storie della vita di San Tommaso Aquino which he praises for the ingenuity of their conception. Vasari describes one of these istorie as a disputation between Saint

Thomas defending the Church ex cathedra and a scuola of heretics - three of whom are named as Sabellius, Arius and Averroes (Pl. 21). While discussing this painting, Vasari also refers to his ownership of a drawing of it by Filippino. He identifies the subject of the second istoria as Saint Thomas praying before the crucifix which utters the words, Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma, and singles out for comment the expressive reaction of the saint's companion (Pl. 20) He then refers to the Annunziata on panel (sic), the scene of the Assumption, and the life-like portrait of Cardinal Carafa, Bishop of Ostia, who according to Vasari was buried in this chapel in 1511 and subsequently removed to the piscopia (the cathedral) of Naples.''

On the whole, Vasari seems well informed on the events surrounding the commission and execution of the painted programme of this chapel although details of his chronology are now a matter of some debate. It also appears that he had examined the subject matter of the paintings more closely for the publication of the second edition, but, as in the case of his chronology, his identification of certain details require further discussion. His description of the tomb chamber and the circumstances surrounding its execution has proved, however, to be extremely illuminating for modern scholars working on the Carafa chapel.

Within the rich corpus of seventeenth and eighteenth-century guide books and descriptions of Rome, the Carafa chapel is regularly cited as one of the outstanding features of the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. The fresco cycle is generally attributed to Filippino, the vault to Raffaellino del Garbo and the altarpiece to Fra Angelico.¹² These

authors, however, make no reference to the tomb chamber and indeed, apart from the brief reference made by Joachim Berthier in his account of the church,¹³ the omission continued in nineteenth and twentieth-century studies of the chapel. In the first major monograph on Filippino, Alfred von Scharf chose to dismiss Vasari's account of the tomb chamber and assumed that Vasari must have been referring to the paintings in the vault of the chapel. In Scharf's view the quality of the painting of the sibyls made it unlikely that it was the work of Filippino and he therefore attributed the sibyls to Raffaellino del Garbo.¹⁴ Katherine Neilson in her monograph on Filippino also assumed that Vasari must have been describing the vault of the chapel.¹⁵ The reasons for such judgements undoubtedly lay in the condition of the chapel at the date when these scholars were writing. For, as revealed by a major campaign of restoration conducted in 1961, the chapel had undergone several drastic campaigns of restructuring.¹⁶

In 1566 the tomb of Carafa's relative, Gian Pietro Carafa, Paul IV, had been installed against the east wall of the chapel.¹⁷ In order to accommodate this massive structure, the original wall had to be demolished and another erected. This caused the destruction of the mural paintings of the Virtues and Vices, described by Vasari. It also encroached upon a small barrel-vaulted room built adjacent to the chapel, destroyed part of its interior decoration (Pl. 23), and effectively blocked the only means of direct access from the chapel to what is undoubtedly the tomb chamber described by Vasari (Fig. 1).¹⁸ This accounts for the tomb chamber remaining largely forgotten until its rediscovery in recent years.

As reported by Carlo Bertelli in his publication of the findings of the restoration campaign, Santa Maria sopra Minerva had been flooded in the early years of the sixteenth century and the chapel murals subjected to severe damp. In addition, water had filtered from the roof into a cavity between the altar wall and the exterior wall of the church. As a result, substantial areas of the painting had suffered from the effects of damp and salt corrosion. The vault was so badly affected that in the seventeenth century it was necessary to repaint the sibyls - almost entirely in the case of the Hellespontine sibyl.¹⁹ This episode may account for Scharf's critical assessment of the sibyls. Recent restoration has revealed that the sibyls and their attendants, in fact, bear comparison with other autograph works by Filippino Lippi (Pl. 19). (Given the practical considerations of the process of fresco painting which involved the speedy co-operation of a team of painters, one cannot afford to be dogmatic on this point.)

Bertelli's account also draws attention to a number of other major losses and alterations to the chapel's decorative scheme. Little remains of what was once apparently a painted dado below the murals, although traces of it can be seen in the south-west corner (Pl. 16). The placing of an eighteenth-century ciborium on the altar table damaged an area of the painted altarpiece (Pl. 17), and a new altar table set up in 1725²⁰ encroaches upon the balanced pattern of the original pavement (Pl. 16). Nevertheless the campaign has achieved the recovery of a fictive canopy (Pl. 14), painted on the altar wall to frame and enhance the altarpiece, and also revealed some of the finer points of the paintings' original execution.

Gail Geiger has recently published a monograph on this chapel which incorporates three earlier articles on aspects of the chapel's painted iconography.²¹ In this work she usefully supplies an appendix of fifteen documents (most of them already published elsewhere) which, by virtue of being assembled together, conveniently chart in chronological sequence a series of references to the Carafa chapel. She also pays due attention to Carafa's motives for commissioning the chapel and to the influence of the Dominicans and their doctrinal beliefs upon the contents of the paintings themselves. She also makes a far more ambitious claim. In her view, Filippino was directed by Carafa to order his paintings so as to follow a highly specific and erudite programme. Thus the paintings of the sibyls and Saint Thomas Aquinas allude to the contents of Part I of the Summa theologica where God reveals himself to mortals, the Virtues refer to the importance of leading a virtuous life as specified in Part II and the paintings on the altar wall represent theological aspects of the Incarnation as rehearsed in Part III of the Summa.²² As will become clear in the discussion below her reliance on the Summa at the expense of other kinds of pictorial and textual inspiration is problematic.

In more general terms, Geiger's monographic study treats the chapel as an autonomous unit to the relative exclusion of how and where other aspects of Carafa's patronage impinge upon it. The aim of the present admittedly long chapter is, therefore, to look at this chapel scheme both in its existing state and from the perspective of its origination and by doing so to locate it firmly within the overall pattern of Carafa's patronage of art, architecture and letters.

The commission

The first reference to Carafa's ownership of the chapel occurs in an entry dated 28/29 October, 1486, in the notarial records of Andrea di Carusiis. The hand is practically indecipherable but in the 'Campione' of 1757, written by the Dominican Giacomo Reginaldo Quadri, which indexes the lost archives of the Minerva, is a reference to this same document. Quadri's entry cites a payment by the priory to Domenico Beneaccaduto for a third of a house adjacent to the church which was then to be destroyed by Cardinal Oliviero Carafa in order to enlarge [my emphasis] his chapel.²³ Berthier states that the Carafa chapel had originally been dedicated to Maria Annunziata and Maria Assunta,²⁴ which would presuppose that the chapel was an older foundation over which Carafa purchased the endowment rights. The architecture of the chapel bears out this suggestion since its simple groin vault is all of a piece with the vaulting of the late fourteenth-century transepts.²⁵ The entrance arch, by contrast, is classical in style and typical of late fifteenth-century architecture (Pls. 14, 15), and therefore presumably represents a later addition to the chapel architecture.²⁶ Since a number of early maps of Rome show the south arm of the Minerva surrounded by housing, it is likely that the property referred to in the legal document had been bought in order to provide a site for the tomb chamber adjacent to the main chapel.²⁷

Two years later, Carafa's well known letter addressed to Gabriele Mazzinghi, Abbot of Monte Scalaro, provides further historical evidence for his plans for his chapel foundation. As seen in chapter two above,

this letter acknowledges Lorenzo de' Medici's part in sending the painter, Filippino Lippi, to Rome in order to work on this project.²⁸ It also provides information about Carafa's first meeting with Filippino and his speedy resolution to award the painter the contract for the work in the teeth of competition from others.²⁹ Carafa furthermore names the painter as the Apelles of Italy and states that he would not change Filippino for the painters of ancient Greece. This is the only surviving statement made by Carafa on art and whilst these are standard forms of compliment, they do indicate that he saw Filippino in a classical context and regarded his work as comparable to that of the artists of antiquity.

A letter dated 4 September, 1488, sent to Lorenzo de' Medici by Giovanni Lanfredini (the Florentine agent in Rome, who, on the testimony of Carafa's letter, attended the preliminary meeting) also refers to the newly awarded contract between Carafa and Filippino. In addition, the diplomat reports that Filippino had left Rome with one hundred ducats which, as Geiger plausibly suggests, may have been given by Carafa to Filippino for the hire of assistants for this project.³⁰

Despite these two tantalising references, no actual contract between the two parties has yet come to light. Information on the actual cost and supply of materials, methods of payment, allocation of work load and time-scale has to be reconstructed from other types of historical evidence.

In a letter dated 2 May, 1489, from Filippino Lippi, then resident in Carafa's palace in Rome, to Filippo Strozzi in Florence, the painter first reassures Strozzi that he has not forgotten the commission assigned to him by Strozzi and that he would return to Florence on Saint John the Baptist's feast day (24 June). He then describes the expensive materials and high degree of craftsmanship used on the altarpiece frame, balustrade and pavement of the Minerva chapel and also remarks on the liberality of Carafa as a patron:

L'opera mia gli sodisfa; e in detta fa una grandissima ispesa senza risparmio di chosa nessuna. Fassi ora un ornamento per l'altare di marmo, che solo il maisterio monta F:™ 250 d'oro in oro larghi: dipoi s'arà ornare, e chosi vole tutto. La chappella non potrebe essere più ornata in terra di pavimento porfido o serpentino, tutto sottilissimamente fatto, un parapetto di marmo ornatissimo, e in effetto tutta richissima.³¹

Filippino's description of the high quality materials is well justified by the chapel's fitments. Skilfully carved marble has been used for the high balustrade at the entrance of the chapel and for the altarpiece frame which has been further embellished by gilding (Pls. 16, 24, 25). Marble, porphyry and serpentine have been intricately worked to form a Cosmatesque pavement for the chapel (Pl. 26).

Filippino was doubtless hinting that Strozzi could be more generous with his payment for the decoration of his own family chapel. As noted in chapter two above, it is remarkable that the cost of the altarpiece

frame alone (250 florins) approached the sum of three hundred florins which Filippino was contracted to receive for painting the entire Strozzi cycle.³² Vasari quotes, moreover, a payment of two thousand ducats for Filippino's work on the Carafa chapel.³³ He regrettably supplies no source for his information. The tables set out by Lehmkuhl of payments for fifteenth-century projects reveal Vasari's quoted price as very generous.³⁴ The fresco cycle is of a scale to require a workforce of several assistants and the modern restoration programme has revealed evidence of liberal use of expensive materials such as gold and ultramarine.³⁵ Notwithstanding the fact that Vasari goes to some pains to discount such considerations, Borsook concludes that Vasari's sum covered the cost of marble and other adornments used in the chapel. Geiger concurs with Borsook's evaluation and further suggests that Vasari's costing also included the painting of both chapel and tomb chamber.³⁶

Given that Filippino itemised so precisely the sculptural materials used in the chapel's decoration as well as specifically referring to the manufacture of the frame (ornamento) of the altarpiece, it would seem that Filippino had indeed been appointed as a kind of artistic entrepreneur for the entire chapel project, overseeing the purchase of materials and relying on skilled local craftsmen to install them. As will be discussed in further detail in chapter five, Carafa apparently adopted a similar kind of arrangement for his chapel in Naples.³⁷ On a more general note, Carafa's ostensible willingness to pay well for the embellishment of his Roman chapel foundation fits in well with the picture painted of him in chapter two, namely a patron both with capital

to spare and with a commitment to utilizing such wealth in order to enhance his own grandezza and that of his family.³⁸

It is not clear from the contents of Filippino's letter what stage the project had reached by May, 1489. While three of the major fittings were apparently nearing completion, Filippino merely states that his work had given Carafa satisfaction. This could be a reference to preliminary drawings for the mural paintings as well as the design for the altarpiece frame. As Neilson first pointed out, the crowning feature of this frame, with its design of satyrs' masks seen in profile, is similar to that of Filippo Lippi's tomb in the Duomo of Spoleto (Pl.25).³⁹ Vasari's account suggests that Filippino supplied the design for the tomb before he reached Rome.⁴⁰ Since, however, the distinctive motif of flanking masks occurs on the lid of a second-century Roman sarcophagus in San Lorenzo fuori le Mura (a church which, incidently, Carafa also embellished⁴¹) and which Filippino could have studied while in Rome,⁴² Neilson's suggestion that Filippino was responsible for both frame and tomb design and that the Spoleto monument relies on the Carafa frame, is well founded.

Filippino had returned to Florence in September, 1488, to make his will.⁴³ Since he received payments from the Strozzi family in August and September, 1489, it would appear that he also returned to Florence in that year, as promised, in order to conduct a campaign of work on the Strozzi chapel.⁴⁴ According to Scharf, Filippino painted the entire vault of the Strozzi chapel and then returned to Rome to complete the Carafa chapel after Filippo Strozzi's death in May, 1491.⁴⁵ It is

unlikely, however, that Filippino would have been able to spend that length of time away from his Roman commission. Given the prestige of the patron and the lucrative nature of the project, it is more likely that Filippino returned to Rome in the spring of 1490 in order to continue work on the Carafa chapel.⁴⁶

The terminus date for the paintings is likewise a matter of debate. The papal bull on the wall of the chapel is dated June, 1493 (Pl. 22).

Bertelli interprets the wording to mean that the Pope had just visited the chapel on the feast of the Birth of the Virgin and therefore proposes that the paintings were completed by 8 September, 1492.⁴⁷

Although the bull does refer to a personal visit by the pope, it only mentions the feast in conjunction with the plenary indulgence granted to any visitor to the chapel on that day.⁴⁸ Burchard refers to a visit made by Alexander VI to the 'new chapel' of the Cardinal of Naples on 25 March, 1493, and this probably constitutes the earliest record of the paintings' completion.⁴⁹

The fact that, by 1494, Filippino was already engaged in new projects in Florence also points to the completion of the main chapel in 1493.⁵⁰

The adjacent tomb chamber was probably painted after the main chapel (Pl. 23) and although the style of decoration agrees with Vasari's attribution of the tomb chamber vault to Raffaellino del Garbo, the second project was probably overseen by Filippino and executed between 1493 and 1494.⁵¹ At all events, by 1497 Carafa had another artistic project in hand, namely the construction and embellishment of a large chapel in the cathedral of Naples.⁵²

The vault

Each of the four vault compartments of the Carafa chapel is occupied by a painting of a sibyl with several angels and a copious number of books (Pl. 19). As identified on accompanying tablets, the Cumaean sibyl appears above the altar wall (Pls. 14, 27), the Hellespontine above the scenes of Saint Thomas Aquinas (Pl. 28), the Tiburtine sibyl over the entrance arch (Pl. 29), and the Delphic sibyl over the wall now occupied by Paul IV's tomb (Pl. 30).

The decision to have the sibyls depicted on the chapel's vault was an unusual one, since it was more common to place either four prophets, or the evangelists, or the doctors of the Church in such a location.⁵³ Since the patron would have supplied the painter with the principal subjects for the chapel's painted scheme, it can be assumed that here is a clear instance of Carafa's direction. The choice of such a subject was appropriate to this chapel for a number of reasons. Firstly, the appearance of four women was suitable for a chapel dedicated to the Virgin.⁵⁴ Secondly, these inspired seeresses of Antiquity were held to have predicted the Incarnation of Christ and, due to the sanction of Lactantius, Augustine and Aquinas, held authority comparable to that of the Old Testament prophets.⁵⁵ The pertinence of the Tiburtine and Cumaean sibyls was probably due to further historical traditions. The Tiburtine sibyl had been identified with Rome throughout the medieval period and more particularly with the church of Santa Maria Aracoeli - the site of her revelation to the Emperor Augustus of a vision of the Virgin Mary and Christ Child. The prominence afforded to the Cumaean

sibyl over the altar wall (Pl. 14) may well be due to the geographical location of her cave at the head of the bay of Naples which would have had a personal association for Cardinal Carafa. In addition Virgil in the Aeneid (Book VI) describes how Aeneas was guided by the Cumaean sibyl to the underworld where he learnt the destiny of Rome which his descendants would found. Virgil further celebrates this sibyl in his fourth Eclogue where he cites her prophecy of a new progeny from heaven.⁵⁶ As will be seen, these Roman associations tie in well with other iconographic themes within the chapel scheme. Finally, as has already been mentioned in conjunction with the contents of Carafa's library, Carafa himself probably once owned a manuscript copy of Lactantius' Divinae institutiones, the most esteemed early source for the authority of the sibyls and their prophecies.⁵⁷

In the Carafa chapel, each of the sibyls is shown holding a scroll on which is inscribed an abbreviated version of one of the prophecies attributed to her. Once again it may safely be assumed that it was the patron who was responsible for this choice of texts. Although the inscription given to the Tiburtine sibyl is that accorded to her by Lactantius, the principal source for all these inscriptions is Filippo Barbieri's Opusculum de Vaticanis Sibillarum, a short treatise which forms part of a larger treatise on the writings of Jerome and Augustine. Since Barbieri was south Italian, a member of the Dominican Order and dedicated the first printed edition (1481) to the Cardinal of Naples, amongst others, it seems entirely likely that Carafa selected passages from this treatise to be included in the painted programme of his chapel.⁵⁸

It is clear from the sibyls' inscriptions which read: for the Cumaean, IAM NOVA PROGENIES C[AE]LO D[E]MITTIT[UR] ALTO (now a new generation will be sent from on high); for the Tiburtine, NASCETUR CHRISTUS IN BETALE[HE]M (Christ will be born in Bethlehem); for the Delphic, PROPHETA EX VIRGINI NASCETUR (A prophet will be born of a virgin); for the Hellespontine, IESUS CHRISTUS NASC[ET]UR DE CASTA (Jesus will be born of a chaste person), that the sibylline texts are those which refer to the miracle of the Incarnation and the Virgin Mary's crucial role in this divine mystery.⁵⁹ These inscriptions are thus particularly apposite for the first dedicatee of the chapel and the principal subject of the painted altarpiece - the Annunziata. The placing of the Cumaean sibyl with her text, which refers to heaven, is equally well-considered since the scene of the Virgin's assumption into heaven occurs on the wall directly below this sibyl (Pl. 14).

It is thus entirely probable that Carafa closely supervised this aspect of the chapel's pictorial decoration and, as a collector of epigrams and inscriptions, insisted upon the evident care taken with the fine lettering used on these inscriptions (Pl. 31).⁶⁰ Responsibility for the pictorial representation of these women and their attendants lay, however, with Filippino Lippi. Close comparison between these representations and the descriptions given in Barbieri's treatise of the sibyls, their costume and hairstyle, shows that the painter was not required to replicate this aspect of the text. In addition, the woodcuts that illustrate the second 1481 edition show little similarity to Filippino's infinitely more sophisticated treatment.⁶¹

By the last decades of the fifteenth century, the portrayal of the sibyls in large-scale painting had become more common both in secular and ecclesiastical settings.⁶² There are four particular instances of which Filippino Lippi was most likely to have been aware. These are: the series of Florentine engravings of prophets and sibyls, attributed to Baccio Baldini and generally dated to the 1470s; the sibyls on the marble pavement of Siena cathedral, executed between 1483 and 1488; the two kneeling sibyls in his father's fresco of the Coronation of the Virgin in the Duomo of Spoleto; and Ghirlandaio's painted vault of the Sassetti chapel in Santa Trinita, Florence, whose decoration was complete by January, 1486.⁶³ Comparison with these examples shows, however, that Filippino adopted a very independent approach to his visualization of these women. Whereas Ghirlandaio, for example, placed each sibyl along the vertical central axis of the vault compartment and portrayed her as seated upright and facing forward, Filippino represented his sibyls in varied contrapposti and as if from different angles (Pl. 19). They therefore appear as far more dynamic in terms of implied movement and emotional expression than the relatively formal sibyls of Ghirlandaio.

Something of the pictorial inventiveness required of Filippino can be gauged from a number of preparatory drawings for these figures. A carefully executed metalpoint study, now in the British Museum, corresponds, apart from the direction of the glance, to the final resolution of the Cumaean sibyl.⁶⁴ By contrast, a freely sketched pen and ink study, now in Lille,⁶⁵ shows a very different pose to any of the paintings of the sibyls. Geiger has suggested, therefore, that it is a

preparatory drawing for the original Hellespontine sibyl (now obscured by seventeenth-century repainting). While Innis Shoemaker thinks the Lille sibyl could be a preparatory drawing for any one of the four sibyls, Geiger's proposal is convincing,⁵⁵ particularly, since, if the Lille sibyl is envisaged within the compartment of the Hellespontine sibyl, the direction of her glance would be towards the spectator standing within the chapel.

Filippino was undoubtedly assisted in this process of figurative experimentation by his familiarity with another project currently being carried out in the sculptural workshop of the Pollaiuoli brothers at Saint Peter's. As first noted by Neilson, the sculpted reliefs of the Virtues and the Liberal Arts on the tomb of Sixtus IV are similar in treatment to the sibyls in the Carafa chapel (Pl. 32).⁵⁷ The closest comparison occurs between Philosophy and the Tiburine sibyl (cf. Pls. 29, 33) where the positioning of the upper part of the body is very similar and between the sculpted figure and the Cumaeen sibyl (cf. Pls. 27, 33), where the placing of the legs and feet is replicated. Since the chronology of both projects is a matter of debate, it is difficult to establish whether it was the painter or sculptor who took the primary initiative.⁵⁸ What is clear, however, is that in both cases the artist responsible wished to exploit the expressive potential of multi-axial poses and through these poses to engage the spectator in an active relationship with these depicted figures. The second aim is the more apparent in the painted figures since they all appear to be looking downwards towards the spectator (Pl. 19).

Another powerful model of which Filippino may have been aware, but which has hitherto been overlooked, is the famous second-century Roman copy of a Hellenistic statue - the so-called Sleeping Ariadne (Pl. 34). At this date it was probably in the possession of the Maffei family who resided behind the Pantheon and thus in close proximity to both the Minerva and Carafa's city residence.⁶⁹ The statue provides a compelling demonstration of how the clothed female body can be portrayed in a reclining position with the head propped up on one arm and the legs crossed. The pose, both graceful and complex, appears to have been adapted by Filippino for his Tiburtine sibyl (cf. Pls. 29, 34). If viewed, moreover, from the other side, the position of Ariadne's sandalled foot would be that of the Delphic sibyl (cf. Pls. 30, 34). Finally in the case of the Cumaeen sibyl, the discreetly veiled but prominent breast is framed by a fall of drapery similar to that of the antique sculpture (cf. Pls. 27, 34).

Thanks to powerful stimuli of this sort, probable made more accessible through his patron's association with Benedetto Maffei (who dedicated two humanist texts to the cardinal⁷⁰), Filippino was able to rethink his portrayal of these celebrated women of Antiquity. Moreover, through techniques specific to the art of painting, in which his training and professional experience in Florence had made him particularly expert, Filippino was able to impart further expressive qualities to these figures. The choice of pale colours (greens, yellows, mauves and whites) set against the deep blue of the vault insured that these figures were more clearly visible from below. An illusionistic detail, such as the Cumaeen sibyl's foot appearing to jut over the painted frame

and as if into the space of the chapel, gives this figure a forceful and commanding presence both within and without the chapel (Pls. 14, 27).

Thus, while Carafa instructed Filippino upon the choice of the sibyls and the texts that accompany them, he relied on the painter's acknowledged expertise as a 'second Apelles' to render these figures as lively and graceful young women, who truly act as heralds to the painted scenes on the walls of the chapel below.

The altar wall.

The choice of dedication of the chapel to the Annunziata was undoubtedly inspired by the special ceremony held annually in Santa Maria sopra Minerva on the feast of the Annunciation. On that day the pope traditionally visited the church in order to attend a pontifical mass and distribute purses of money to a number of young unmarried women for their dowries. Once again Burchard supplies graphic descriptions of the ceremonial procedures for that day. His account of 25 March, 1488 (the year that the painted scheme in the chapel was contracted), is a particularly detailed one. He relates how the pope rode to Santa Maria sopra Minerva with the cardinals and other members of the papal court in attendance. Mass took place at the high altar with precise seating arrangements in the choir of the church for the pope and three ranks of cardinals. After mass, officials from the confraternity of the Annunciation offered the celebrant a basin with ten purses full of money. One was opened to check its contents, then ten girls came forward, each dressed in white and accompanied by two matrons. Having

received a purse from the celebrant, each girl kissed the foot of the pope. After the ceremony the pope rode to another much venerated Roman church, Santa Maria del Popolo.⁷¹

Burchard reports on the regular attendance of Cardinal Carafa at the Annunciation day ceremonies held in the Minerva. According to him, Carafa failed, despite strong efforts, to persuade Alexander VI to attend this event in 1498 and 1499. As mentioned above, after its completion in 1493, Carafa's chapel occasionally featured as part of the programme for that feast day.⁷²

The annual custom of awarding dowries is also recorded in a painted altarpiece commissioned in 1499 from Antoniazio Romano by the Confraternity of the Annunziata for their chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Pl. 35).⁷³ In this painting (as appropriate to its celebratory and commemorative function) the Annunciate Virgin is shown enacting the role of the celebrant and rewarding three girls with purses of money while the founder of the confraternity, Cardinal Juan Torquemada, appears as their sponsor.⁷⁴ As a patron of the Dominicans and the Minerva, Carafa also associated himself with this local confraternity as is evident from his will where he bequeathed fifty ducats to the Confraternity of the Annunziata with the proviso that its members hold a procession to his chapel on the feast of the Birth of the Virgin.⁷⁵

The ceremonies performed in the close vicinity of the chapel on the feast of the Annunciation and the patron's active participation in them offer one reason for the choice of the Annunziata as the focal point of

the chapel's decorative scheme. The altarpiece's subject, however, is not a straightforward depiction of the Virgin Annunciate accompanied, as convention demands, by the Archangel Gabriel and the dove - symbol of the Holy Spirit. It also includes a portrait of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, kneeling before the Virgin in the guise of a suppliant with Saint Thomas Aquinas assisting in this act of petition (Pl. 17). This painting thus combines two types of image, one designed to celebrate the Virgin as the Annunziata and the other to celebrate her as Divine Mediatrix. Geiger has remarked on the relative rarity of this subject in fourteenth and fifteenth-century painting and discussed in some detail possible theological meanings and pictorial sources for such an image.⁷⁶ As she indicates, fifteenth-century theologians discoursing on the Annunciation tend to place a new emphasis on the meaning of the event. For Saint Thomas Aquinas in the Summa Theologica, the subject of the Annunciation provides an opportunity to argue for the suitability of the Virgin Mary as a vehicle for the Incarnation and to applaud her willingness to co-operate in this sacred mystery. By contrast, Saint Bernardino in his sermon on the Annunciation, given in Siena in 1427, and Saint Antonino in his Summa sacrae theologiae, interpret the Annunciation as a demonstration of the Virgin's dual role as the instrument of the Incarnation and mediator for Divine Grace.⁷⁷

Geiger's conclusions as regards the focus of contemporary theological debate on the Annunciation receive added confirmation from the late fifteenth-century sermons preached to Carafa and his fellow cardinals during the liturgies of the papal chapel. In these sermons, the doctrine of the Incarnation emerges as particularly prominent and,

indeed, the feast of the Annunciation is often construed as the feast of the Incarnation. Closely linked to this preoccupation with the Incarnation is the belief that the Incarnation is a sacred mystery which both secured man's salvation and dignified human nature.⁷⁹

Indeed, Geiger's argument would be all the more pointed had she recognised that the originality of the altarpiece's subject lies not in the fact that Carafa had his portrait introduced into a painting of the narrative of the Annunciation, but, rather, that he insisted on being commemorated as a suppliant before the Annunziata,⁸⁰ the first titular saint of his chapel and more importantly, the vehicle for the Incarnation.

The choice of Saint Thomas Aquinas both as Carafa's sponsor in the altarpiece painting and as second titular saint of the chapel is appropriate for a number of reasons. He was a major Dominican saint and therefore a suitable choice for any church under the care of the Dominican Order; he was one of the patron saints of Carafa's home town of Naples; finally, as already noted in chapter three, Carafa claimed kinship with the saint and took an educated interest in his scholarship.⁸¹

The reason why Carafa chose to be commemorated on this altarpiece in the guise of a suppliant, petitioning the Virgin Annunciate to mediate on his behalf, is made more explicable by his original intentions for the chapel. In his will, he gives a clear indication of these as:

Corpus aut[em] relinquo et mando tradi ecc[lesiastice] sepulture et
pri[us] deponi intra capellam mea[m] beate Mari[ae] et beati
Thome Aquil[ina]tis super [Minervam?]. Ac deinde transferendu[m]
Neapolim. Ac sepelliendum i[n] catedrali ecc[lesi]a in alia
capp[ella] mea ubi co[r]pus et sanguis beati Ianuarii. Requiescit
tumulo mihi moderate et sine pompa [sic] facto.⁸¹

Carafa thus intended that he be first buried in the tomb chamber
(ecclesiastice sepulture) and then transferred to the chapel of the
Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples. Today no inscription marks
Carafa's mortal remains in either of these chapels, but an entry in a
Neapolitan chronicle indicates that in 1511 these instructions were
local knowledge and Vasari, writing in 1568, was also aware of the
tradition that Carafa was buried first in the chapel of Santa Maria
sopra Minerva and then in the cathedral of Naples.⁸²

The altarpiece's imagery of the chapel's founder being introduced by a
saint to the Virgin (albeit in her guise of Annunziata) is typical of
the sculpted decoration of innumerable Renaissance tombs,⁸³ and thus
appropriate to the chapel's specified function as a private funerary
chapel.

Filippino Lippi, therefore, had a complex task to perform in the
painting of this altarpiece. Firstly, he had to represent the
traditional view of the Annunziata - a woman whose purity and wisdom
made her a willing instrument in God's plan for mankind's salvation.
Secondly, he had to give due significance to her role as Divine

Mediatrix. Thirdly, his painting had to register his patron's hope's for future salvation and life after death.

As Geiger has demonstrated, there are a number of pictorial precedents for Filippino Lippi's painting of donor figures in the company of the Annunziata. The most relevant of her examples, in terms of what Filippino would have known, is the painting by his own father, Filippo Lippi, for the oratory of the Larioni at Pian di Ripoli near Florence (Pl. 36).⁸⁴ A comparison between these paintings is instructive since it emphasises the novelty of Filippino's design which, in all likelihood, resulted from Carafa's particular requirements for this altarpiece.

The two paintings have a number of features in common. In both cases the Annunziata is placed at the centre of the design with the Archangel Gabriel to the Virgin's right. The two protagonists are distinguished from one another by a platform on which the Virgin is raised, thereby emphasising her status as the principal cult figure. The donor figures appear on the right. In the Carafa altarpiece, however, Carafa and Saint Thomas Aquinas are shown in much closer proximity to the Virgin and therefore have a more intimate and privileged relationship with her. The distribution of colours helps, moreover, to relate the four painted figures to each other. For example, the pale greens and blues of Gabriel's wings and draperies link this figure to the Virgin Mary arrayed in a pale blue mantle with a green lining. Alternatively the red of Carafa's mantle, reinforced by the curtain behind Aquinas, is picked up in the Virgin's robe and Gabriel's sleeve.

The relationship between these figures is made the more effective by the subtlety of their individual poses, each of which contributes to the impression of a complex range of emotions binding them together. The Archangel is shown in a pose which suggests both movement and reverence and thereby illustrates the scope of his mission as one who brings news but also waits upon a favourable response (Pl.37). The Virgin's pose is as complex; the direction of her glance denotes an awareness of Gabriel, yet her body is still aligned in the direction of Carafa and the position of her right hand is one of blessing. Her gaze appears unfocused, giving the impression of a person digesting the contents and weighty implications of Gabriel's astounding news (Pl.38).^{es}

Filippino Lippi's likeness of Carafa is clearly taken from the life and bears comparison with another portrait of the patron executed in marble for the Succorpo in Naples (Pls. 39 and 107). Filippino's skills in portraiture are exemplified by two of his Florentine altarpieces, one of which includes the portrait of Francesco del Pugliese and the other of Tanai de'Nerli and his wife, Nanna di Neri di Gino Capponi.^{es} On his Roman altarpiece he showed his patron arrayed in a red cardinal's mantle with the surplus material of its ample fur-lined hood gathered into a fold of material on the right shoulder - an arrangement seen in other representations of cardinals at that date.^{es} Beneath the mantle is depicted a finely pleated white surplice, worn apparently over a red robe. A white shirt is also visible at the neck and cuffs. The head is portrayed in profile and the rendition of the face with its prominent nose, deep-set eye-sockets and receding chin offers a skilful

characterisation of Carafa as a man of middle age who is both aristocratic and ascetic in appearance (Pl. 39).

Compared to the earlier painting by his father, Filippino's setting is relatively sparse in detail. Closer analysis reveals, however, that it too contributes to the religious meaning of this altarpiece. As Geiger points out, behind the figure of Gabriel is a painted barrel vault with Carafa's coat of arms at its centre (Pl. 40). The compartments of its coffered surface are similar in shape and design to those of the tomb chamber which lies adjacent to that side of the chapel (cf. Pls. 23, 40). Thus the vaulted passageway and its closed door could serve a dual function in the iconography of the altarpiece. It could represent the porta clausa, a long accepted symbol for the Virgin birth and therefore appropriate to the subject of this painting. It could also symbolize the gate to heaven. Saint Antoninus in his Summa sacrae theologiae relates the image of a closed door to entry into heaven, stating that man would find two gates to the temple of Jerusalem, Christ and the Virgin, one gate open and the other closed.⁸⁸ The architectural style of the barrel-vaulted passage is also characteristic of the entrance halls of a number of late fifteenth-century palaces.⁸⁹ Thus the proximity of the painted barrel-vaulted passageway to Carafa's actual burial chamber would seem to allude to Carafa's hope that, through the mediation of the Virgin Annunciate, he might attain entrance into heaven.

Other objects depicted in the alcove behind the Virgin Mary signify similar sorts of preoccupations. The books on both the desk and shelf

imply an interest on the part of the Virgin in study, far exceeding her traditional reading of the prophet Isaiah. They also serve both as an indication of the erudition of Carafa, who adopted the book as his personal impresa, and an advertisement for the revered writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas. The book displayed over the closed door in the left background may also be a form of pictorial allusion to the Book of Life which contains a list of names selected by God for eternal life, an object discussed extensively by Aquinas. Depicted on the shelf above the figures are two jars, one in the shape of a carafe and containing what appears to be two sprigs of olive (Pl.41).³⁰ This is a pictorial reference to the name of the patron of the chapel, and is an image that occurs again in the decoration of the tomb chamber. Besides the carafe appears another ceramic vase identifiable as an albarello, a container used for storing spices for embalming. It contains a dry twig. The close juxtaposition of living and dead vegetation acts as a powerful symbol of death and resurrection and is made the more compelling by the proximity of the open and closed book (Pl. 41).³¹ As these objects appear directly above Carafa, their symbolism can be directly related to him.

This theme of triumph over death (which was central to Carafa's preoccupations when founding this chapel) is reaffirmed in the choice of subject matter for the mural on the altar wall. It depicts the moment at which the body of the recently deceased Virgin is reconstituted with her soul and enters heaven, as recounted in such standard sources as the Legenda aurea (Pl.14). The Virgin Assunta is shown framed by smoking tapers (essential and costly items used at the funerals of fifteenth-

century cardinals³²) and enclosed by a circle of cherubim, delicately incised on the surface of the wall. Nine angels (whose very number might be intended as a reference to the nine orders of angels³³) form an outer circle around her (Pls. 18, 42, 43). Six are shown playing a variety of accurately observed wind and percussion instruments.³⁴ While these musical instruments would not have been played together in the Renaissance, they were all capable of producing a vigorous and joyous sound and were thus appropriate to the celebratory event portrayed.

In the lower half of the composition, an open tomb appears tucked behind the left frame (Pl. 44). The relief on the front face of the tomb depicts an amoretto on the back of a triton, who is blowing a conch shell. The relief on the side of the tomb shows a male and female centaur (Pl. 45). Both details were a standard form of decoration for a number of classical sarcophagi that had survived and were still visible in fifteenth-century Rome.³⁵ The close proximity to the tomb of the kneeling Saint Peter and his attribute of the keys might imply that this scene was envisaged not merely as a commemoration of the Virgin's triumph over death but also as the triumph of the Church.

In the landscape setting, a bare tree appears on the left and to the right its leafy counterpart (Pls. 46, 47, 48). Thus, as in the alcove of the altarpiece, a piece of incidental detail carries connotations of life after a period of dormancy (Pls. 41, 46, 48). Given the funerary function of this chapel, Carafa could only have been gratified by the inclusion on the altar wall of such pointed reminders of life-everlasting.

Again, Filippino Lippi was presented with a challenge when painting this subject. Two drawings survive as evidence of his preliminary ideas for it. The first, identified by Berenson as a study for the lower part of the Assumption, shows the painter at the stage when he was establishing the composition and the figures of the apostles within it.⁹⁶ The second shows a group of eleven apostles in animated poses, some of whom are analogous to the Carafa apostles. Brandi has suggested that this represents an early sketch for the Assumption. Despite Bertelli's misgivings, based on the absence of any indication of the altarpiece, Shoemaker's point that the two groups are worked out separately is a telling one. In terms of style, this drawing is, thus, probably a copy of a lost drawing made by Filippino for the Assumption.⁹⁷ On the evidence of these two surviving drawings, the painter had, therefore, to work through a range of ideas before arriving at his final solution.

One of the problems faced by Filippino was how to fit his narrative subject around the painted altarpiece and its frame (Pl. 14). There was at least one important and recent precedent for such a combination. The altar wall of the Sistine chapel, completed by 1482, combined a frescoed altarpiece of the Assumption with murals of the Discovery of Moses in the bullrushes and the Nativity on either side of it. The sketch that survives of this lost altarpiece by Perugino is interesting, since, as in the case of the Carafa altarpiece, it shows the founder of the chapel, Sixtus IV, kneeling in adoration before - in this instance - Maria Assunta - with Saint Peter as his sponsor (Pl. 49).⁹⁸ In all probability Carafa later commissioned an altarpiece from Perugino (which mirrors the design of the lost Sistine altarpiece) for the high altar of

the cathedral of Naples (Pl. 153).⁹⁹ As a prominent member of the Sacred College, Carafa frequently attended pontifical mass in the Sistine chapel and would therefore have been very familiar with its mural decoration. He may well have conceived the idea of integrating the subject of the altarpiece with that of the altar wall, so that, like the pope, he could be seen receiving the blessing of the Assunta, as well as that of the Annunziata, titular saint of his chapel (Pls. 14, 17, 42). A rapid pen sketch by Filippino of Botticelli's Punishment of Korah indicates that the painter was also aware of at least one of the Sistine chapel murals, probably as a result of his close association with Botticelli who may have given Filippino access to his preparatory drawings of this commission.¹⁰⁰

In terms of spatial illusionism, Filippino apparently took some pains to make his altarpiece and mural distinct from one another, as if to signify the greater liturgical significance of the former painting. The Assumption is seen as if through a framework of painted architecture, whose perspective enhances the illusion of looking upwards at the triumphal ascent of the Virgin into heaven (Pl. 14). The original painted dado, showing sculpted reliefs in grisaille, must once have enhanced the effect of looking beyond the architecture of the chapel to a panoramic landscape lying behind it.¹⁰¹ The illusion of depth implied by the framing piers is further enhanced by the newly-recovered canopy hanging as if on top of the altarpiece frame and tied by cords to the architrave of the framing piers. While the canopy denotes the high status and sanctity of the Annunziata, it also acts as a skilful

pictorial device for demonstrating the position of the altarpiece and frame as situated in front of the piers.

Filippino also sought, however, to relate the two paintings by his use of colour. The draperies of the Assunta in her canonic colours of deep blue and red reiterate, but with a subtle variation, the pale blue and red of her alter ego below. The strong and definite tones of the red, black and white of Carafa's and Aquinas' clerical garb make these two figures stand out against the bulkier figures of the apostles, whose mantles have been worked in a range of bright saturated colours. The musical angels display an inventive range of colours similar to those used for the garments of the Archangel Gabriel, and in a rather witty way, the red and white of the Carafa coat of arms, held by pairs of putti at the top of the framing piers, have been worked into the costumes and instruments of the three musician angels who appear to the right of the Assunta just as Carafa appears to the right of the Annunziata in the altarpiece below (Pls. 14, 50).

Compared to the formal pose of Perugino's Assunta, enclosed in a rigid mandorla of cherubim heads, Filippino's Assunta is portrayed as an animated and vivacious being (cf. Pls. 42, 49). Her ascent is made more emphatic by the varied poses of the nine angels,¹⁰² whose swirling draperies reinforce the sense of energetic movement and the emotional tone of celebration (Pls. 18, 43, 50). The fact that she is shown slightly foreshortened adds to the dramatic effect. Neilson's proposal that Filippino may have been stimulated by the example of Melozzo da Forlì's mural of the Ascension of Christ, then in the apse of SS

Apostoli, is well founded, particularly since Filippino's figures share something of the robustness of those by Melozzo.¹⁰³

The apostles, skilfully grouped in depth within the narrow field on each side of the altarpiece, display an inventive range of gesture. Details such as the hair and beard have been sketched in with a sure touch and bravura flourish (Pl. 51). The emphatic stance of the figure seen from the back on the left (Pl. 44) is taken up by another equally expressive pose on the right (Pl. 47). Both figures perform the crucial task of directing the viewer's attention towards the Assunta above. The range of emotions apparently registered on the faces of these eleven figures acts as a powerful inducement to the devotee before the altar to share their wonder at this manifestation of another of God's miracles.

Apart from Saint Peter, whose identity is clearly denoted by the keys, the other ten figures can only be identified as traditional pictorial types for Christ's chosen apostles with the addition of either Saint Matthias (Judas' replacement) or Saint Paul (who occasionally features in paintings of the Assumption).¹⁰⁴ As is typical of a number of fifteenth-century paintings of the subject, Saint Thomas is shown absent from the event, but with the incident of his receiving the Virgin's girdle included in the background (Pls. 44, 46).¹⁰⁵

The landscape, with its distant vistas of two cities, appears Flemish in derivation (Pls. 46, 48). The architectural style of the cityscapes and the exotic nature of the procession in the right hand background

(Pl. 48), suggest that Filippino intended to denote a distant and foreign place as the setting for the Virgin's assumption.¹⁰⁶

In conclusion, therefore, the altar wall was devoted primarily to articulating the patron's devotion towards the Annunziata - the first dedicatee of the chapel - by celebrating both her state at the Annunciation and her assumption into heaven. Both these images were designed to serve the cult of the Virgin as Divine Mediatrix, whose intervention would assist Cardinal Oliviero Carafa in the matter of his personal salvation and attainment of eternal life. In order to convey these distinct yet mutually reinforcing aspects of Marian iconography, Filippino Lippi created a pictorial scheme on the altar wall of the chapel which was both highly wrought in its individual parts and yet satisfyingly well-integrated in its overall impact.

The west wall: the upper mural

If the murals on the altar wall are primarily devoted to the glorification of the first dedicatee, those on the west wall celebrate the memory and achievements of the second (Pls. 16, 20, 21). On the upper part of this wall is a painted narrative which has hitherto customarily been identified as the Miracle of the Crucifix (Pl.20). Vasari in his second edition of the Lives is the earliest source to describe this painting in this way. He writes: 'Evvi anco quando orando San Tommaso, gli dice il Crucifisso: Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma: ed un compagno di lui, che, udendo quel Crucifisso cosi parlare, sta stupefatto e quasi fuor di se'.¹⁰⁷ The incident described by Vasari

occurs in the early biographies of the saint. William of Tocco, for example, relates how, after Aquinas had completed his treatise on the Eucharist, he was praying before a crucifix. Three of his companions saw the saint elevated from the floor before this crucifix, from which a voice was heard, saying: 'thou hast written well of me, Thomas, what reward wilt thou have'? The saint replied: 'none but thyself, Lord'.¹⁰⁸

In the Carafa mural, Aquinas kneels before a crucifix, with rays of light appearing from above and directed onto the saint's head (Pl. 52). Scholars have therefore tended to accept Vasari's identification of the subject of this painting. Certainly this incident would have been of relevance to Carafa, since it was held to have taken place in an ancient church attached to the Carafa family church of San Domenico Maggiore in Naples. The thirteenth-century painted panel of Christ on the Cross with the Virgin Mary and Saint John Evangelist, which is reputed to be the same image that spoke to the saint (despite the specification of a crucifix in the early sources), had become the property of the Carafa family by 1560, if not earlier, and is today still an object of veneration in their family chapel in San Domenico.¹⁰⁹

Comparison between the Carafa mural and other representations of the Miracle of the Crucifix reveals, however, a number of anomalies. For example, in a panel by Sassetta depicting this subject the saint is shown in front of a crucifix but there are no angels or attendant figures in secular costume with him (cf. Pls. 20, 52, 53).¹¹⁰ Even allowing that this is a small-scale predella panel and Filippino's painting a large-scale mural, the presence of additional figures in the

latter requires some explanation. To date, a number of proposals have been put forward. Berthier states that the scene on the left depicts another incident in the saint's life when he had expelled a woman of mauvaise vie from his presence whereupon two angels visited him to reward him with a girdle of chastity. The book depicted at the foot of the crucifix represents the Summa and therefore acts as a symbol of Christ's future approbation of Aquinas' writings.¹¹¹ Mengin suggests that the youth in the background is the saint under custody in the Rocca Secca, when his family, refusing to accept his religious vocation, imprisoned him in their family stronghold. Berti and Baldini elaborate upon this suggestion by stating that the figures on the right are Saint Thomas' brother persuading his father, mother and sister of the saint's true vocation, but accept that the left-hand scene represents the miracle of the crucifix. Bertelli points out, however, that it is unlikely that the Count of Aquilano would be portrayed in what is clearly Oriental costume (Pl.54) and therefore interprets the right hand group as bystanders being alerted to the miracle of the crucifix.¹¹² Geiger presents an amalgamation of three of these scholarly interpretations, arguing that the scene on the left represents the miracle of chastity and the rest of the painting a coherent narrative which depicts in detail the circumstances surrounding that miracle.¹¹³

Examination of the early hagiographic sources in conjunction with the painting itself, and the pictorial precedents for such a scene, provide strong evidence to support Geiger's case that one of Filippino's objectives was to depict the miracle of chastity. William of Tocco, for example, relates how when the saint was imprisoned by his family, who

were opposed to his religious vocation, they arranged for a courtesan to be sent to him. Aquinas expelled this woman from his room, prayed for strength to resist this temptation of the flesh and accordingly two angels were sent to his assistance, one girding a cord around his loins.¹¹⁴ A fourteenth-century predella panel, attributed to the workshop of Bernardo Daddi, provides a straightforward pictorial representation of this incident in the saint's life (Pl. 55)¹¹⁵ and provides a much closer prototype for the Carafa mural than does the standard iconography for the miracle of the crucifix (cf. Pls. 20, 53, 55).

Given the descriptive details supplied by William of Tocco, it is significant that in Filippino's representation of the saint a striped sash is knotted tightly around Aquinas' waist beneath his scapular (Pl. 52). It provides a striking contrast to the somewhat louche arrangement of the scarf of a similar design around the loins of the male figure on the extreme right (cf. Pls. 20, 52, 54). In addition, both angels are shown holding the saint's mantle back to enable this sash to be seen, and the angel to our left appears to be pointing to the girdle. The lilies that they are carrying, are, of course, standard symbols of purity.

There are number of other persuasive arguments to support this identification of the subject of this mural. It provides a strong visual statement of the saint's title of Doctor angelicus, which owed its derivation to the early biographers' testimony of the saint's reputed virginity. William of Tocco provides an emphatic acknowledgement of

this aspect of Aquinas' sanctity: 'Erat enim praedictus Doctor virgo purissimus, mente et corpore nitidus, sicut ex ore suorum confessorum certissime est compertum'.¹¹⁶ It is for this reason that the saint is often represented with the lily as an attribute, as, for example, in the architectural medallion set over him in the mural immediately below the painting in question (Pls. 57, 58). One of the most authoritative testimonies for the virginity of the saint occurs in a vision said to have been experienced by the Dominican friar, Albert of Brescia, some years before the saint's canonisation in 1323. According to the account of the vision given by Bernard Gui, Aquinas appeared to brother Albert in the company of Saint Augustine, who extolled Aquinas' teaching and defence of the faith. Augustine concluded that while Aquinas was equal to him in glory, Aquinas surpassed him in having the aureole of virginity.¹¹⁷

This vision would have been familiar to Carafa and the friars of the Minerva since, in the Dominican office for the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas, reference occurs in the ninth lesson both to Aquinas' appearance: 'cum torque duplici, cappa gemmis ornatus', and to Augustine's words: 'Thomas par est in gloria virginalis per stans mundicia'.¹¹⁸ As described in chapter three above, Carafa was an important patron of this feast day, instigating special liturgical ceremonial in the Minerva and more particularly within the chapel itself.

That this mural should thus celebrate the theme of Aquinas' virginity was, moreover, highly appropriate within the context of the painted

programme for the chapel as a whole. The angels with their lilies form a counterpart to the Archangel Gabriel on the altarpiece and thereby suggest an analogy between the purity and chastity of the Virgin Mary and those of the saint (Pls. 17, 37, 52). The text which the Hellespotine sibyl displays in the vault directly above this mural makes a direct reference to the theme of purity (Pl. 28).¹¹⁸ The depicted incident of Saint Thomas the Apostle receiving the Virgin's girdle at her assumption might have also provided additional reason for the choice of this relatively rare hagiographic subject. Cardinal Carafa, as an ecclesiastic who would have taken a vow of chastity, and, on the testimony of Girolamo Marco Vida, as a man remarkable for the purity of his life,¹²⁰ would have found this theme of divinely sanctioned virginity particularly consonant with his own preferences and aspirations.

Notwithstanding the strong visual and iconographic evidence for the left hand scene representing the miracle of chastity, Berthier's idea of Filippino retaining details from the traditional iconography of the better-known miracle of the crucifix is an attractive one. Geiger ingeniously accounts for the vivaciously rendered crucifix as a more compelling way of representing the sign of the cross made by the saint (as recounted in the early sources) and thinks that two books at the foot of the crucifix are those smuggled to the saint during his imprisonment.¹²¹ In support of Bertier, however, an explicit reference is made in the second lesson for Matins on Aquinas' feast day to the saint's imprisonment and his rejection of the advances of the young woman (*puella*). The text then reads: 'orat pressa cruce mirificia (my

emphasis] *renes cingit manus angelica*',¹²² thus providing tacit approval for the conflation of two separate episodes. In the sermons prepared for the special ceremonies held under Carafa's aegis in the chapel on that day, the miracle of chastity receives relatively scant attention. Far greater emphasis is placed upon the miracle of the crucifix as a sign of the saint's wisdom and its divine inspiration.¹²³ In short, there remains the strong possibility that Carafa instructed Filippino to combine these two incidents in order to provide, firstly, an analogy to the *Annunziata* and, secondly, to highlight Aquinas' status as a doctor of the Church and privileged interlocutor with Christ.

What of the remaining figures in this painting? Geiger provides very precise identifications for all of them based on her close but literal-minded reading of the biographers' narration of the event which marked the miracle of chastity. In her view, the group on the right represent members of Aquinas' family, his pious sister Marotta, his mother Donna Theodora, his brother Rainaldo, and his already deceased father Count Landulf. According to her, the young man in the centre middleground represents another brother, Landolfo, and the friar in the act of running from the saint's chamber, John of San Giuliano - who visited Aquinas at Roccasecca.¹²⁴ Although a possible explanation, certain aspects of it remain problematic, not the least of which is the fact that Count Landulf appears in an Ottoman turban and what looks like a tallith - a Jewish prayer scarf (Pl. 54). Geiger proposes, however, that this exotic costume acts as an allusion to the amalgam of Latin, Arabic and Hebraic cultures gathered at the south Italian court of Frederick II of which Count Landulf was a leading member.¹²⁵

An alternative interpretation might be that the group on the right represents Rainaldo with the courtesan, her procuress (*ruffiana*) and male agent (*mezzano*). Geiger rejects this idea as sufficiently indecorous for the pictorial decoration of a chapel within a major Dominican church.¹²⁶ The main source for comparison, in terms of the representation of the courtesan within the genre of religious mural paintings, occurs in cycles devoted to the legend of Saint Benedict. While such scenes figure in either the sacristy or cloister of Benedictine foundations and not in chapels as such, they do provide evidence that, should the hagiography require it, the appearance of women of ill-repute was legitimate.

It is also of interest that in Sodoma's mural at Monteoliveto which depicts the incident when seven women were sent to dance lasciviously before Benedict and his fellow monks, a small fluffy lap dog - similar in type to Filippino's dog - also features. Geiger herself suggests that this animal in the Carafa painting might have been included as a sign of uncleanness, indulgence and female sexuality and therefore an analogue of the courtesan's threat to the saint's purity and moral virtue.¹²⁷

There are, however, a number of other salient reasons why it is unlikely that the courtesan and her professional companions have been depicted in this mural. The young man seen from the back appears to be in the act of persuading this group on some course of action which, by the direction of his pointing finger, relates to what has already happened to the saint (Pl. 54). The only plausible candidate for the 'very

beautiful meretricious young woman'¹²⁸ is dressed in modest garb and carries a string of paternoster beads (Pl. 56). Having already suggested, therefore, that the content of this mural painting might be less strictly narrative than its unified pictorial format at first suggests, another interpretation of the right hand group might be that the two women and the oriental represent certain types of person - widows, young women taking holy orders and captive Turks - all of whom would be deemed particularly in need of the saint's moral exemplum and divinely-inspired teaching.¹²⁹

Filippino's response to the challenge of organising this complex iconography was a characteristically spirited and imaginative one. Indeed, if the sexual innuendoes were intentional, the overwhelming probability is that they were due to Filippino's fertile imagination rather than any instructions given by Carafa himself. Whilst, in the depiction of the fictive coffered arch which frames the mural, the painter acknowledged the actual viewpoint of the spectator, he chose to arrange his perspective around a vanishing point on a level with the upper moulding of the pedestal of the pier which separates Aquinas from the other figures (Pl. 20). This factor, combined with the decision not to show the figures foreshortened, made for a clear representation of the action. He also used the painted architecture to divide the scene into three discreet parts linked by the expressive poses assigned to the principal figures. To the left, isolated by an elaborately decorated pier, Filippino placed the key figure of the saint, accompanied by the two angels. The black and white of the Dominican habit, together with the emphatic gesture of the saint's outspread arms, further insured

Aquinas' importance within the overall pictorial design. The angle of the head and eyes suggest both humility and an awareness of the cause of the saint's consolation, an expression reiterated by the two angels on either side of him (Pl. 52).

On the extreme right, the two men have been characterised as contrasting counterparts in terms of pose, age and nationality. The expansive gesture of the younger man and the fluid treatment of his drapery contribute decisively to the drama (Pl. 54). The rich primary colours deployed on the flamboyant costumes of the two men are in direct contrast to the more subdued colours of the two women which, in turn, present a subtle variation of the colours used on the habits of the two Dominicans on the left. Finally, the two parts of the painted scene have been linked by a number of subsidiary figures with the backward glance of the Dominican friar patently focussed upon the saint and his two angelic companions (Pl. 20).¹³⁰

The west wall: the lower mural

The lower mural on this wall is also devoted to celebrating Aquinas who is represented at the centre of a complex figurative scheme (Pl. 21). He is shown seated in an open-sided architectural structure that has the scale of a chapel. Beside him, on a marble bench, are four female allegorical figures who can be identified by the letters on their robes as (from left to right) Philosophy, Theology, Dialectic and Grammar. In his left hand Aquinas holds a book (Pl. 57) which displays a text taken from the first book of Corinthians (1:19): 'SAPI/ENT/IAM SAPI/ENT/UM

PE/RDAM' (I will destroy the wisdom of the wise). He points emphatically towards a bearded figure recumbant at his feet, who, in turn, bears a scroll inscribed, 'SAPIENTIA VIN/CIT MALITIAM' (wisdom conquers evil) - a condensed version of a verse from the Book of Solomon (VII:30): 'Sapientiam autem non vincit malitia (evil, moreover, does not conquer wisdom). Just below, inscribed on the front of the podium is the phrase, DIVO/ THOMAE/ OB/ PROSTRATUM/ IMPIETATEM (to Saint Thomas on account of the debasement of impiety). In the lunette above the saint, two cherubs support a roundel (Pl. 58) which is decorated with the saint's attributes of lily, glowing jewel, and book. The book is inscribed with the text of Proverbs (VII:7), VERIT/ATEM/ MEDIT/ABITU/R GUCT/UR MEU[M]/ ET LABI/A MEA D/ETEST/ABUNT/UR IMP/IUM (for my mouth shall utter truth and my lips shall hate impiety). Two cherubs, perched on the cornice of the saint's cathedra display two tablets (Pl. 21) on which is written a verse from Psalms (CXIX:130): 'DECLARATIO SERMON[UM]/ TUORUM ILLUMINAT/ ET INTELLECTUM/ DAT PARVULIS' (the declaration of your words gives light. It gives understanding to the simple). On the edge of the step below (Pls. 21, 57) is yet another inscription taken from Psalms (LXIV:8) which reads: 'INFIRMAT[IA]E SUNT CONTRA EOS LINGU[A]E EORUM (they shall make their own tongues to fall upon themselves).

In front of this somewhat damning statement stand two groups of figures. With the exception of six figures in fifteenth-century ecclesiastical or secular costume, the remaining figures are rendered the more distinctive by their exotic dress. Between the two groups lie a pile of books, scrolls and sheets of torn paper. Two of the books are shown open and displaying further texts. On the book to our left, the text reads: SI

FILIUS/ NATUS/ EST/ ERAT/ QUAND/O NON/ ERAT/ FILIUS:/ ERROR/ ARII (The error of Arius: if the Son is born, there was a time when the Son was not). On the other book: PATER/ A FILIO/ NON E/ST ALI/US, NEC/ A SPIRI/TU SAN/CTO: ERROR/ SABELII (Error of Sabellius: the father is not another [substance] from the Son nor from the Holy Spirit). Finally, in the background of this scene appear a number of buildings, classical in style, and two distant views (Pl. 21).

From the number of inscriptions, it is clear that this mural was conceived as primarily didactic in tone. As such it belongs to a class of paintings specifically designed to celebrate Saint Thomas Aquinas as a theologian and teacher and, more specifically, to make the claim that his writings were divinely inspired, superior to those of non-Christian persuasion, and immensely significant for the Christian community as a whole. Thus, if Aquinas' title of Doctor angelicus is commemorated in the upper mural on this wall, his other and better known title of Doctor communis, doctor and teacher of all, is effectively summarised by the painting below it (Pls. 20, 21).¹³¹

As remarked in chapter three, by the time of the chapel's inception, Saint Thomas Aquinas' feast day had achieved a liturgical prominence in Rome comparable to that of the four Latin Church Fathers. Thus the saint was implicitly made equal to them long before the official proclamation made by Pius V.¹³² Since the Carafa chapel figured prominently in the liturgies of that feast day, the choice of subject for this large and imposing mural was all the more apposite.

By the late fifteenth century, a pictorial scheme had been devised to represent this somewhat abstract aspect of Aquinas' sainthood.

Significantly, the most important versions of it to have survived originated, a quarter of a century after the saint's canonisation, in churches and priories belonging to the Dominican Order. Five of them are worth examining in further detail in order fully to understand this Dominican iconography and to appreciate how the Carafa mural both relies on and innovates within this genre.

A painting on an early fourteenth-century panel, attributed to the Biadaiolo illuminator, depicts one of the earliest of these glorification scenes.¹³³ Aquinas is shown seated on a teaching chair (cathedra) before a lectern and thus in the guise of a medieval doctor lecturing his pupils. A network of gold lines fan out from the book in front of him towards his audience of clerics and laymen. This device - a symbolic representation of heavenly light and, by extension, the illumination which Aquinas' writings shed on the minds of his pupils - became standard in paintings of this type. Standing on either side of the saint's audience are two figures of unidentified prophets or saints whose presence acts as an endorsement of the sanctity of Aquinas' teachings. Below the dais of the saint's cathedra is a recumbant bearded figure shown in a pose associated in early medieval art with defeat. As Julian Gardner has pointed out this motif of Aquinas enthroned with an adversary below derives from an earlier tradition where a seated patriarch or emperor was represented as presiding over an early Church council or synod devoted to the unmasking and condemnation of heresy. Examples which he cites are those of the lost cycles in the

Vatican and San Pietro, Naples, and an illumination in an manuscript now in the Biblioteca Capitolare, Vercelli. To these, Geiger adds the example of the tenth-century Menologion for Basil II (c.958-1025). As both authors note, the motif also occurred in the eleventh-century mural for the audience chamber of Calixtus II in the Lateran Palace.¹³⁴

Thus this early version summarises the most important features of this particular pictorial genre, devised by the Dominican Order to celebrate its newly-acquired saint. It portrays Aquinas as a teacher whose writings inspire and illuminate the minds of both religious and laity by its orthodoxy (as personified by the two other saints) and its outright refutation of heresy (as personified by the recumbent figure at his feet).

Francesco Traini's panel, executed circa 1340-1345 for the Dominican convent of Santa Caterina, Pisa, shows a further elaboration of this iconography (Pl. 59).¹³⁵ Aquinas appears at the centre of the design and placed before a mysterious circular form.¹³⁶ A complex system of gold lines interconnect the saint and the books on his lap with other parts of the composition. By following this geometric pattern, the viewer unravels the message of the image. The mind of Aquinas is directly inspired by Christ at the apex of the design, and also by the writings of Moses, Saint Paul and the four Evangelists (who also benefit from Christ's spoken word). At a lower and therefore less elevated level, the works of Aristotle and Plato offer inspiration to Aquinas, the painter thereby acknowledging the debt that the saint owed to these two classical authors. By contrast, Averroes' book, coverside up, is

transfixed by a single ray of light issuing from that of Aquinas, thereby emphasising the saint's rejection of this thirteenth-century Arab writer's commentaries on Aristotle's De anima as rehearsed in the Tractatus de unitate intellectus contra Averroistis. Finally in the lower part of this painting, two groups of clerics are seen as recipients of Aquinas' divinely-inspired teaching.

Within two decades another major representation of this theme was completed for the chapter house of the Dominican priory of Santa Maria Novella in Florence (Pl. 60).¹³⁷ In the context of a study of the Carafa chapel, this mural by Andrea di Bonaiuto is of particular significance, since Filippino Lippi, commissioned to paint the Strozzi chapel in the adjacent church, must have been aware of this fourteenth-century precedent for his Roman mural. As in the small fourteenth-century panel, Aquinas has been portrayed as a teacher seated in his cathedra.¹³⁸ He holds a book which displays two verses from the Book of Wisdom (VII:7-8) On either side appear Saint Paul, Old Testament prophets and the Evangelists and below, various personifications of human knowledge together with their historical representatives. On the step of the saint's cathedra are three figures in somewhat dejected postures and with closed books. They represent once again the false knowledge over which Aquinas' superior and divinely-inspired intellect has triumphed.¹³⁹

While it is clear that the central subject of this fourteenth-century mural is reiterated in the Carafa mural, the fifteenth-century version also utilises another aspect of the chapter house's painted programme.

On the opposite wall of the chapter house is another mural whose principal theme is the leading role of the Dominicans in the salvation of mankind (Pl. 61). In the lower right-hand part of this painting, three Dominican saints are shown confronting a number of heretics. In particular, one of the Dominicans displays a book to a group of heretics who apparently acknowledge their error by kneeling, tearing their hair and, more significant still, ripping a page from a book. This detail finds an echo in the torn sheets of paper in the foreground of the Carafa mural (Pl. 21). The contrast made in the fourteenth-century painting between the enthroned figures on the spectator's left and the heresiarchs on the right itself had precedents in earlier examples of conciliar representations.¹⁴⁰

On a slightly different theme, but definitely part of this iconography, is a mural executed by an anonymous Lombard master around 1370-1375 for a chapel dedicated to Saint Thomas Aquinas in the Dominican church of Sant'Eustorgio in Milan.¹⁴¹ Although the recently restored painting is badly damaged, it clearly shows Aquinas holding a book, seated in the centre on a cathedra and flanked by a bishop and a pope (presumably Saint Gregory and another of the Church Fathers). Above, Christ appears holding a book and flanked on the left by an angel, originally one of a pair. Similarly, the three prophets, two Evangelists' symbols and seated churchmen once had counterparts on the right. Beneath the feet of Aquinas, fragmentary remains of his audience are visible. The theme of this mural is once again that of Saint Thomas Aquinas, drawing his inspiration from the most authoritative sources (the Bible and the Latin Fathers) teaching a doctrine of unquestionable orthodoxy, which, in

turn, illuminates, as the glowing jewel on his chest symbolises, the entire Church.

Finally, in a panel executed by Benozzo Gozzoli, the iconography of the Santa Caterina panel is recast in a fifteenth-century idiom (Pls. 59, 62).¹⁴² Again Aquinas appears at the centre of the scheme but now surrounded by a circular mandorla. (The text on his book is an extended version of the text on the architectural medallion of the Carafa mural.) Christ appears at the apex of the design with the speech attributed to him at the miracle of the crucifix inscribed between the two figures. A similar cast of figures appears either above or on a level with the saint, as appropriate to their status and relationship to his teaching. In this particular version the recipients of the Saint's words are shown as a full-scale convocation of ecclesiastics and scholars presided over by a pope.

The Carafa mural constitutes an amalgamation of these various prototypes. In common with all these examples, it unambiguously presents Aquinas in the guise of theologian and victor as the central cult figure (Pl. 57). Although he appears to be supported by clouds,¹⁴³ he is not seen as a heavenly apparition as in the paintings by Traini and Gozzoli (cf. Pls. 57, 59, 62). The impression given by the architectonic cathedra is that of doctor and teacher, a tradition which was initiated by the Biadaiolo illuminator and reinforced by the large-scale murals at Sant'Eustorgio and Santa Maria Novella (Pls. 57, 60). In the Carafa painting, however, Aquinas is portrayed as actively presiding over a disputation which involves not the clergy (as in

Gozzoli's painting) but primarily heresiarchs. In this respect the Carafa mural incorporates an aspect of the Church militant in the chapter house of Santa Maria Novella (Pl. 61) and, at one remove, representations of early Church Councils which were committed to the defeat of heretical and unorthodox views as regards the nature of Christian belief.

A preparatory drawing provides further evidence for the original intentions of the painter and his patron in constructing this pictorial scheme (Pl. 63).¹⁴⁴ As it differs in a number of respects from the finished work, it offers an indication of the particular features of the completed work which were deemed crucial.¹⁴⁵ In general, the format of the drawing is different from that of the completed mural, with the former having more vertical emphasis. A major alteration occurs in the foreground where a podium, fronted by a flight of stairs and, on the left, a freely-sketched balustrade, has been replaced in the mural by a platform with its front face decorated with fictive sculpted reliefs (now partly obliterated). The dedication tablet has been introduced at the point where the flight of stairs appears in the drawing (cf. Pls. 21, 63). This initial design would, therefore, have made a bold parallel with the chapel itself and its balustrade (Pls. 24, 63). In order, however, to accommodate the crucial record of papal dispensation (Pl. 16), a more two-dimensional decoration, with a pronounced all'antica flavour, was apparently deemed a better solution for the painted dado of this mural.

In the drawing, the architecture of the saint's cathedra has been freely conceived with four piers supporting two arches at its sides and a pedimented structure on its back wall. In the painting, it has been made more classical in style, embellished with antique ornament, and with four piers supporting an entablature. The entablature in turn is surmounted by a groin vault (mirroring that of the chapel itself), and a simple lunette which provides a convenient place for the saint's attributes and one of the painting's key inscriptions.

In the drawing, the saint appears under a rapidly delineated canopy with three angels around it. In the final version, these are transformed into cherubs and putti and removed to points in the architecture where they can conveniently display three inscriptions. The saint's portrayal is altered to show him pointing emphatically towards the defeated figure below him (conspicuously missing in the drawing), while looking towards - and therefore acknowledging - the figure of Theology. Another rapidly executed drawing of Aquinas by Filippino bears a closer relationship to the final figure than this compositional drawing.¹⁴⁶

The figures in the foreground display a far greater variety of activity and are more disorganised in their arrangement than in the painting. On the left appear a cardinal and members of his retinue. This group is preceded by two figures, one of whom carries a mace and is similar in terms of placement and pose to the figure in the final composition (cf. Pls. 21, 63). Presumably the cardinal was originally intended as a portrait of the patron, but was subsequently removed in order to place him in a far more significant part of the chapel's painted scheme.

In the background of the mural, the arcaded building on the extreme left and the saint's cathedra frame a distant view of a church with an equestrian statue before it. On the right, buildings act as a frame for a riverside vista. Both these topographical details are notably absent in the preparatory drawing.

The final painted version constitutes a simplification and consolidation of the appearance and identity of the foreground figures, aided by the portrayal of their costume and, in some cases, lettering giving their names. A number of inscriptions (an area generally controlled by the patron), have been introduced at keypoints of the design, together with new and precisely detailed topographical views in the background. The figure of the cardinal and his entourage have been removed, but two Dominicans have been introduced on the left. The figure with the mace has been retained. In general, the architectural setting has become more antique in style. The newly introduced features afford further insight into the significance of this mural for Carafa and the Dominicans of Santa Maria sopra Minerva.

Saint Thomas Aquinas, characterised by his portly features, black and white Dominican habit and the glowing jewel on his breast, is portrayed in the classic pose of a figure of authority in triumph over a vanquished enemy. As noted by Halm, the piers and back wall of the saint's cathedra are embellished by eight fascas, further signs of the occupant's rank and authority.¹⁴⁷ In the architectural medallion above the saint, three objects provide a symbolic representation of the vision of Arnold of Brescia (Pl. 58). The glowing jewel, described in the

vision as on the saint's breast, appears above a book - a straightforward allusion to the saint's title of doctor. Framing it are the lilies - symbolic attributes of his title as virgin. As argued persuasively by Hall and Uhr, this medallion could also signify a classicized version of the double aureola crown, referred to by Arnold of Brescia.¹⁴⁸ The aureola constituted an additional recompense added to the reward of beatitude, represented in art by the halo around a saint's head. It was only granted to those saints who achieved one of three victories, either as martyr, virgin or doctor. Usually the aureola was depicted in art by a crown; thus in the Sant'Eustorgio mural, two angels appear above the saint bearing two crowns, one decorated with stars symbolising the aureola of doctors, and the other, lilies, signifying the aureola of virgins. In the case of the Carafa mural, moreover, as Hall and Uhr state: 'whoever planned the final programme was clearly aware that the aureola doctrine had its remote allegorical exegesis in the table moulding mentioned in Exodus 25:25'.¹⁴⁹ Consequently the aureola symbols to which Aquinas was entitled have been enclosed within the classically-derived ornament of this architectural medallion.

The book itself displays the opening lines of Aquinas' Summa contra Gentiles. In the introductory chapter, the author offers an explanation of what this quotation signifies. In his view, the role of the wise man is to consider the ultimate end of the universe, which is divine truth. He continues by noting that in every branch of knowledge (scientia) there are two contrary elements, one of which is to be pursued and the other opposed. Thus, in the case of medicine, the physician's objective

is to effect health on the one hand and eliminate illness on the other. In an analogous way, the wise man meditates on, and then speaks forth, divine truth while at the same time refuting the error that is opposed to it. This error, Aquinas concludes, is called impiety because is the opposite of religion which is piety.¹⁵⁰ Clearly the deviser of the inscriptions for this painting was aware of this passage and its argument when he selected this particular text from it, since another inscription dedicates the entire edifice of the cathedra to the saint on account of Impiety being overthrown. The prostrate figure below Aquinas must, therefore, personify the sin of impiety to which both inscriptions allude.

The inscription on the scroll held by Impiety and the book displayed by Aquinas himself both refer to the virtue of wisdom, its victory over evil and, by extension, to the destruction of fallacious knowledge. The latter meaning has a greater bearing on the significance of the saint's relationship to the figures outside his cathedra. The double reference to wisdom is, however, particularly apposite to Aquinas since his hagiography places special emphasis on his wisdom and the way in which it was received through divine grace.¹⁵¹

In the Summa contra Gentiles, and more extensively in the Summa Theologica, Aquinas constructs an intellectual programme which demonstrates his interpretation of the soul's progress towards the attainment of divine truth. The Santa Caterina panel provides, as it were, an attempt to visualise his views on this subject. Within the figurative composition, a hierarchy has been devised: at the base of the

design, appear human beings with their limited sense of perception; above them, Aristotle and Plato who represent the powers of reason; next, Saint Paul, Moses, and the Evangelists who represent the wisdom and power of faith; and finally at the apex of the design, Christ, the embodiment of divine truth (Pl. 59).

A type of hierarchical ordering has similarly been devised for the four personifications of human knowledge in the Carafa mural (Pl. 21). Only two of the Trivium - Grammar and Dialectic - figure in this scheme. They appear to the left of Aquinas and therefore on the inferior side. The primarily didactic role of the intellectual disciplines that they personify (namely mounting a well-structured argument and testing it by logical disputation),¹⁵² is neatly summarised by the text displayed above them: 'it gives understanding to the simple'. Meanwhile, Philosophy and Theology appear in places of honour to the right of Aquinas and also on the altar wall side. More particularly, the saint looks towards Theology, which is appropriate given that Aquinas, while arguing for a fundamental concord between philosophy and theology, constantly alludes in his writings to the superiority of faith (as personified by Theology) over reason (as personified by Philosophy).¹⁵³ Theology, made more distinctive by her crown, points in turn towards a cloud from which (as modern restoration has revealed), a series of gold rays once issued.¹⁵⁴ This gesture on the part of Theology thus emphasises the point that Aquinas is the recipient of divine illumination, as reiterated in the inscription above: 'the entrance of your word giveth light'.

The spiritual enlightenment of certain of God's agents is given similar visual form elsewhere in the chapel's painted scheme. The sibyls are shown as if illuminated by a network of gold lines fanning out from the centre of the vault, thereby emphasising the divine source of their prophetic knowledge (Pls. 19, 27, 29, 30). In the altarpiece, the dove of the Holy Spirit appears on a flight path of gold rays, as if to signify that God's plan for mankind's salvation was effected by the Virgin's comprehension of the spiritual message that she received (Pl. 17). Finally, in the Miracle of Chastity, Saint Thomas Aquinas is again seen under the beneficial rays of divine light (Pl. 52).

The inscription on the step before the saint's cathedra continues the theme of Thomist debate on the nature of true and erroneous knowledge, and clearly alludes to Aquinas' adversaries grouped in the foreground of the painting. In many respects, this gathering of representative heresiarchs constitutes the most innovatory part of the painting (Pl. 21). Hitherto, Aquinas had been customarily depicted in the company of orthodox clerics and scholars, with only one, or possibly three, heresiarchs in a position of subjugation beneath his feet. Here, however, a whole gathering of historical personages, anathematized by the early Church for unorthodox heretical views have been portrayed.

The task of identification of these figures is eased by the lettering on the two books in the foreground and on several of their costumes. The venerable bearded figure on our left represents the Alexandrian presbyter, Arius (c.260-330), who was condemned at the Council of Nicea in 325 (Pl. 64). His heresy - that God the Father created the Son from

nothing and therefore the Son was not of the same 'substance' as the Father - appears in an abbreviated form on the open pages of the book on the ground before him (Pl. 21). His counterpart, a splendidly austere figure at the head of the right hand group, is identified as Sabellius, who, as a third-century Roman citizen, has been portrayed with all the gravitas of a senator (Pl. 65). Again, his erroneous doctrine of the unity of the Godhead and by extension, his failure to distinguish between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, appears in abbreviated form on the pages of the book beside him (Pl. 21).

Behind him, with a short pointed beard and turban (Pl. 65), appears Eutyches, the heresiarch condemned in 451 at the Council of Chalcedon for denying the two natures of Christ - divine and human - after the Incarnation. Another figure in this group, arrayed in a fur-lined turban, represents the Persian mystic, Manicheus (c.216-276), who transformed the doctrines of Saint Paul into a coherent body of uncompromisingly dualistic Gnostic dogma. In the group led by Arius, the figure furthest to our left is identified as the Syrian bishop, Apollinarius (c.310-390), who, as an opponent of Arius, was seen as a great champion of orthodoxy, but was condemned in 381 at the Council of Constantinople for his denial of Christ's humanity.

The elaborate turban of the figure beside Apollinarus has 'US' inscribed upon it. The loss of other letters make the identification of this heresiarch problematic. Given the fact that the other figures all represent heresiarchs condemned by the Church in the third, fourth and fifth centuries, this figure may well represent Photinus, the fourth-

century Bishop of Sirmium, who was deposed and exiled after the Council called by the Emperor Constantius. None of his writings survives, but according to Saint Augustine, his error was that he denied the pre-existence of Christ, although he allowed that Christ was born of a virgin and endowed with super-human excellence.¹⁵⁵

Since Aquinas provides a refutation of all six of these heresiarchs in his Summa contra Gentiles and since it is also in this treatise that he develops most fully his doctrine on the Trinity, Geiger argues that the principal aim of this painting was to convey Aquinas' Trinitarian views.¹⁵⁶ As discussed above, the opening lines of this treatise do, indeed, appear on the architectural medallion of the saint's cathedra,¹⁵⁷ but it is by no means clear why Aquinas' defence of the Trinity should be a major iconographical theme for the Carafa chapel.

A more careful reading of Book IV of the Summa contra Gentiles reveals that while in chapters two to twenty-six, Aquinas did, indeed, address himself to the Trinity, the first fourteen chapters were devoted to God the Father and God the Son, and the nature of their relationship, and it is precisely in these chapters that the author disputes at some length the doctrines of Arius, Sabellius and Photinus. By contrast, in the chapters devoted to the Holy Spirit, only the briefest reference is made to Arius and Sabellius, whilst in chapters 27 to 55, when Aquinas directly addresses the Incarnation, he debates with Arius, Eutyches, Manicheus, Photinus and Apollinarius.¹⁵⁸

A more consistent iconographical theme both for the mural itself, and for the chapel programme as a whole, would appear to be, therefore, the representation of the debates which culminated in the formulation of Christological orthodoxy. Such debates certainly had Trinitarian elements to them, concerning as they did the Church's doctrine regarding the dual nature of Christ and therefore by implication his relationship to God the Father and the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁹ The central theme of these controversies, however, was the refutation of a series of specifically Christological heresies. The resulting judgements by the early Councils of the Church against the teachings of these heresiarchs eventually led to the fully developed doctrines of the Incarnation (the first stage of which was celebrated on the painted altarpiece), and of the Hypostatic Union. As mentioned above, these mysteries were given special prominence within the sermons of the papal chapel and thus in the intellectual circles in which Carafa moved.¹⁶⁰ In addition, this particular doctrinal issue exercised Lactantius in the Divine Institutes, a work which Carafa probably owned and which provided an endorsement of the status of the sibyls' authority,¹⁶¹ as portrayed on the vault above the mural in question.

Amongst the group of exotically clad heresiarchs (whose costume represents a skilful attempt on the part of Filippino to signify the dress of the patristic era) are a number of figures in fifteenth-century garb. On the far right appear two Dominicans, the first of whom has rightly been identified by Bertelli as a portrait of Fra Giacomo Torriani, Master General of the Dominican Order from 1487 to 1500.¹⁶² The portrait head is similar in physiognomy to that on a commemorative

medal struck in Florence in 1498 on the occasion of Torriano's attendance at Savonarola's trial (Pls. 66, 67).¹⁶³ The distinctive aquiline nose in both these portraits is also evident on Torriano's tomb slab now housed on the wall of the corridor leading to the sacristy of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Thus, in the place of Cardinal Carafa in the drawing, another contemporary representative of the Church has been included in this painting. On a personal level this was appropriate, since Torriano was an associate of Carafa.¹⁶⁴ As the current Master General, he also personified the Dominican Order; his inclusion thus demonstrated the Order's continued efforts to preserve the Thomist traditions of orthodox teaching on matters of ecclesiastical doctrine.

In order fully to convey this message, Filippino brought into play a piece of skilful illusionism. The scene as a whole is set as if behind a boldly conceived architectural framework. Solid piers, seen in perspective, act as a means of introduction to the figures grouped beside and behind them (Pl. 21). The foremost figures are seen, however, as if standing on a platform which appears to extend forward of the framing piers. The figure of Torriano, rendered the more striking by the black and white of his Dominican robes, overlaps the front face of the right pier and therefore acts as an intermediary between the notional spectator in the chapel and the rest of the painted figures. His pointing gesture contributes to the didactic role of guiding the spectator's attention towards Aquinas who, within the terms of the painting's iconography, personifies the source of true knowledge.

The identity of the other Dominican is less secure. Various views have been put forward, but none can be verified through comparison with portraits of the individuals concerned. One suggestion has been that he represents Cajetan. Given the close personal contacts between this Dominican theologian and Carafa, it is an attractive hypothesis. Nevertheless, since this figure, like Torriano, wears a doctor's cap and Cajetan did not receive his doctorate until 1494, by which time the chapel's painted scheme had been completed, it is unlikely that this figure is Cajetan. In all probability, he portrays another as yet unidentified, high-ranking official in the Dominican hierarchy (such as the Vicar General of the Order, or the Prior of the Minerva).¹⁶⁵

The group on the left is led by a figure holding a mace (Pl. 64). Geiger has rightly rejected Berthier's proposal that he represents either Arius' or Carafa's mace-bearer, and Bertelli's suggestion that he is a portrait of Filippino's former Florentine patron, Pietro di Francesco del Pugliese. His coat of mail, gorget, sword and ceremonial mace indicate his military and ceremonial capacity. Geiger's identification of this figure as Niccolò Orsini, third Count of Pitigliano and Nola, who was appointed Captain General of the papal army in 1489, is entirely convincing.¹⁶⁶ The fleshy facial features are those portrayed on a medal struck between 1485 and 1495 to commemorate Orsini's post as captain general of the Florentine army and the Roman Church (cf. Pls. 64, 68).¹⁶⁷ Carafa himself had personal contacts with the Orsini family and must have instructed Filippino to include this portrait of one of its leading members.

Several other figures have been identified by various scholars as members and close associates of the Medici family. As the contents of that family's archive demonstrate, Carafa had close relations with Lorenzo il Magnifico and his son Piero, on both an official and on a personal level. These proposals, therefore, merit serious consideration. Berthier has suggested that the two boys on the right are portraits of Lorenzo's youngest son, Giovanni and nephew, Giulio. The elderly man and his younger companion, positioned between Eutyches and Manicheus, are, in his view, portraits of Marsiglio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. By contrast, Bertelli, on the basis of a perceived likeness to a posthumous portrait by Bronzino, proposes that the younger of the two is Lorenzo's eldest son, Piero (Pl. 65). In the left hand group, the head and shoulders of a young man also appear as strikingly contemporary (Pl. 64). Both Berthier and Bertelli note a likeness between this figure and the portrait of a young man in the Uffizi; Berthier proposes that both represent Piero de' Medici and Bertelli, either Giulio or Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici.

There are, however, a number of objections to these proposed identifications. The dress of the young boys is too fanciful for the attire of fifteenth-century Italian youths (Pl. 65), and more closely resembles that of Sabellius and Manicheus. The boys may just as plausibly represent young disciples of these two heresiarchs. The facial features of the so-called Pico figure have little similarity to those on Pico's portrait medal,¹⁶⁹ although Bertelli's comparison with the portrait of Piero de' Medici is more convincing. The head of the young man on the left (executed like all these heads in a single

giornata¹⁷⁰), bears a closer similarity to that of the figure behind the seated proconsul in the mural of Saints Peter and Paul before the proconsul in the Brancacci chapel. Vasari first identified this figure as a self-portrait by Filippino, and indeed the figure is shown looking outwards - a standard device for autograph self-portraits of this type.¹⁷¹ In the Carafa mural, the rather handsome face is similar in type, and apart from minor changes of hairstyle, strikingly akin to the Brancacci self-portrait. Since the young man is not portrayed as looking outwards, the figure does not immediately give the impression of an autograph portrait (Pl. 64). Nevertheless, Filippino may well have wanted to utilise his familiarity in depicting his own features so as to provide, in the most economic way possible, another addition to this complex and varied group of figures.

In the background, two urban views add a further dimension to the pictorial statement of the contemporary power of the Church, as personified by Torriano and Orsini. On the left, behind the figure of the Captain General, is a distant vista of the famous equestrian monument of Marcus Aurelius, set upon the base erected for the Jubilee of 1475, and in its former position before the basilica of San Giovanni Laterano (Pl. 69).¹⁷² Comparison with Marten van Heemskerck's mid-sixteenth-century drawing reveals that Filippino chose to show the statue silhouetted against the holy stairs, rather than include the north transept entrance and its benediction loggia, as seen in the later representation (cf. Pls. 69, 70). Thus one of the basilica's most venerated relics - the stairs which were reputed to be those which Christ climbed to the praetorium of Pontius Pilate and which Saint

Helena brought to Rome - was given particular prominence in this painted detail. San Giovanni Laterano, the city's cathedral and seat of the pope as its bishop, was itself the symbol of the Church in Rome. It was also a church particularly revered by the Dominicans as the location of the alleged meeting between Saints Dominic and Francis.¹⁷³

As for the equestrian monument, by the late fifteenth century the rider was variously held to represent either Constantine, or an anti-imperialist popular hero, or Marcus Aurelius.¹⁷⁴ In the context of this mural, however, it must have been primarily envisaged as a symbol for the all-embracing temporal power of the Church.

In the right-hand background is a view of the Roman port on the Ripa Grande of the Tiber (Pl. 71),¹⁷⁵ from which, in May, 1472, Carafa had embarked on his naval expedition against the Turks, a venture for which he received numerous encomiums.¹⁷⁶ In order to underline the pictorial allusion to the theme of victory over the infidel, the spandrels of the arch through which the riverbank scene is viewed have sculpted reliefs of Victories - a standard device on a number of triumphal arches still standing in Rome.¹⁷⁷

Geiger thus has some grounds for her contention that this mural should be renamed the Triumph of Roman Church Orthodoxy.¹⁷⁸ The foregoing examination of its various components has revealed how Filippino reworked a pictorial genre initially devised by the Dominicans to portray the orthodox nature of Aquinas' scholarship and its benefits for the Christian community at large. By grafting an earlier hierarchical

design of Aquinas enthroned and surrounded by a number of personifications and representatives of human knowledge onto one of Aquinas in active debate with the originators of the heretical doctrines which he sought to refute, Filippino made a novel contribution to the repertoire of Thomist iconography. Moreover, he skilfully broke down the inherently schematic nature of the earlier prototypes by showing the saint and his allegorical companions within one architectural edifice, further dignified by its classical decoration. The somewhat dated device of including inscriptions in order to underline the didactic nature of this representation has been cleverly handled: the texts are displayed in an elegant humanist script, and introduced into the design in a logical and well-integrated manner.

Aquinas' opponents have been dignified by their scale, and cleverly characterised with an eye to their historical personae. Amongst them two distinctive representatives of the contemporary Church, in its temporal and spiritual guise, have been included. Their significance has been enhanced further by the depiction of the mother church of Rome, and the embarkation point for a holy crusade to defend the Church. Thus the Church's major task of defeating heresy, an enterprise to which Aquinas had made a major contribution and one that was an ongoing matter at the time of painting, received visual form through the skills and abilities of Filippino Lippi and his assistants. For Carafa, the defender of orthodox doctrine and belief on behalf of the Dominican Order, papal legate and commander of a crusading fleet, and member of a number of reform commissions, this reinterpretation of a standard

Thomist iconographical theme must have possessed a compelling personal dimension.

The east wall

During the mid-sixteenth century, the east wall of the chapel was entirely demolished in order to construct the massive tomb monument of the Carafa pope, Paul IV. Nothing remains of the paintings described by Vasari: 'Vi se vede, dunque, dove la Fede ha fatto prigionia Infedeltà, tutti gli eretici ed infedeli. Similmente, come sotto la Speranza è la Disperazione, così vi sono molte altre Virtù che quel vizio, che a loro contrario, hanno soggiogato'.¹⁷⁹ Scholars of the Carafa chapel have tended to accept this passage as an accurate description of the lost mural on that wall, although it has to be said that Vasari's identification of the subjects of the other chapel murals has been proved to be imprecise. Nevertheless, this subject of Christian Virtues subjugating Vices, while more common in medieval than Renaissance art,¹⁸⁰ would be an appropriate theme to pair with the Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas on the opposite wall. Aquinas himself devoted several chapters in the Summa theologiae to the role of various virtues in God's plan for man's salvation.¹⁸¹ This series of Virtues seen at their moment of triumph over their vicious counterparts, would also have made a strong parallel to the portrayal of Aquinas as a victor over Impiety. The fact that they would have originally appeared on the wall of the entrance to the cardinal's tomb chamber (Fig. 1) further enhances their iconographic significance. Virtues were frequently included on fourteenth and fifteenth-century tombs, representing, as it were, the

virtues of the deceased and the means by which he or she might attain life-everlasting.¹⁸²

As to Filippino's treatment of these allegorical figures, this can only be a matter of speculation. Bertelli has identified a drawing in the Uffizi,¹⁸³ attributed to Filippino, as a preparatory sketch for several of the Carafa Virtues. It shows on the recto, Fortitude and Temperance, both labelled; Fortitude as a male figure in crown and antique cuirass, battling with a lion beside a fortified tower; Temperance as a crowned female figure, holding a large key and seated beside a castle with a tree inside its walls. She rests her feet on a recumbent male figure, denoted as Epicurus, presumably chosen as a personification of worldly excess. On the verso are symbols of the four Evangelists, and Prudence as a crowned female figure with the Assyrian king, Sardanapulus (again labelled), beneath her feet. On the evidence of this drawing, it appears that Filippino decided to represent his Psychomachia in a highly imaginative way, replete with classical allusions. In this respect, the fanciful portrayal of the Muses and Music on the altar wall of the Strozzi chapel probably offers as good an indication as any of what the mural on the east wall of the chapel once looked like.¹⁸⁴

The painted framework

The chapel is further dignified by a painted architectural framework which binds the pictorial scheme together into a coherent unity. Replicating the classical style of the entrance arch, each corner of the chapel is marked out by a pair of adjacent piers (Pl. 72). On the altar

wall, these piers support a painted arch whose fifteen coffers mirror those of the chapel's entrance. With their front faces decorated with lavish ornament, executed in grisaille on a blue ground, these fictive architectural elements provide an ornate framework for each of the painted scenes they enclose (Pls. 14, 16).

Each compartment of the vault is enclosed by painted ribs, decorated with a running motif of entwined pruned branches, incorporating rings alternating with palmettes and open books.¹⁸⁵ These converge on a central wreath executed in stucco, enclosing Carafa's coat of arms, orientated towards the altar (Pl. 19).

On the west wall, the piers appear as if set behind the front face of the podium on which the company of heresiarchs and contemporary personages stands. Above, the elaborate capitals support a full entablature whose frieze, in turn, is further distinguished by a series of liturgical implements (Pl. 21). This painted entablature supports, in somewhat unorthodox fashion, an arch whose bold egg and dart ornament frames the mural of the Miracle of Chastity (Pl. 20).

While this painted framework carries the hallmarks of the all'antica style of late fifteenth-century Italian architecture, it is also much more lavish and fantastic in its decoration - a tribute to the painter's art over that of the stone-carver. In his chapel of the Succorpo, Carafa was able, however, to utilise the services of stone-carvers to emulate something of the varied and imaginative repertoire of the

painted architectural ornament of this earlier scheme produced under his aegis.¹⁸⁶

The delicately painted frieze on the west wall in the Minerva chapel represents a highly naturalistic rendering of objects designed for the Christian liturgy (Pl. 21).¹⁸⁷ At its centre, framed by two candles, is a paten with Christ in the tomb, a pictorial embodiment of the Corpus Christi. Behind it are two scourges (symbolic references to the Flagellation) and beneath it, as if hanging over the edge of the architrave, the veronica, a reminder of the holiness of the sacrament which could only be handled with covered hands (Pl. 73). On either side of this eucharistic tableau are grouped a variety of other objects used in fifteenth-century liturgical practice.

While it was not without precedent to include representations of this type of object on the periphery of painted narrative cycles (as, for example, the fourteenth-century still-lives executed by Taddeo Gaddi for the Baroncelli chapel, Santa Croce, Florence¹⁸⁸), the Carafa frieze has a distinctively all'antica flavour to it. As pointed out by Halm, series of this sort occur in antique architecture where a building might be decorated with a frieze depicting a series of ritual objects used in antique sacrifice.¹⁸⁹ Four sections of such a frieze survive today in the Museo Capitolino in Rome, and show implements of this type together with a number of nautical details such as ships' prows and anchors.¹⁹⁰ In the late fifteenth century, these reliefs were built into an interior wall of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura and were an object of study for a number of Renaissance artists. One of the sheets of the Codex

Escorialensis, for example, depicts a number of details from this antique frieze (Pl. 74).¹⁹¹ As an object of Carafa's patronage,¹⁹² this ancient church and its decoration were certainly familiar to him, and he may well have instructed his painter to rework these symbols of ancient religious practice into a clearly recognisable Christian idiom for the further embellishment of his chapel.

A number of other related factors support this hypothesis. Bramante was later to embellish the Tempietto with a frieze which also had liturgical objects carved on each of its metopes. Carafa, as one of Bramante's first patrons in Rome, may well have encouraged the architect to include this embellishment as a particularly apt form of architectural ornament for a martyrium erected in honour of Saint Peter.¹⁹³ On the painted piers which frame the Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas in the Minerva chapel, the distinctive motif of an antique ship's prow has been incorporated (Pl. 75). This ancient nautical symbol has been further embellished with an olive leaf - a pictorial reference to the patron's Christian name. On the ancient frieze, once housed at San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, are two ships' prows. It thus seems that Filippino utilised this particular model and included one of its motifs in a reworked form within the framework of the Carafa scheme (cf. Pls. 74, 75). It also appears, from the accounts given by Burchard of certain occasions when correct liturgical procedure was at issue,¹⁹⁴ that Carafa was deemed an expert and his opinion frequently consulted. Taken in conjunction with this cluster of personal associations, the painted frieze offers another significant and plausible instance of intervention by the patron within the chapel's painted scheme.

The front face of each of the piers is decorated with a candelabra motif which begins on a solid base and becomes progressively more slender towards the apex where a flame is shown burning. The design of the candelabra ornament is different on the altar wall from that of the west wall (Pls. 21, 72). In general terms, the decoration derives from antique sculpture (particularly funerary objects) and also from the painted grotesques which had recently become available as models to those artists intrepid enough to climb down to the subterranean chambers of the Domus Aurea.¹⁹⁵

Vasari provides a vivid testimony of Filippino's enthusiasm for the study of antique artefacts:

fu primo ancora a dar luce alle grottesche che somigliano l'antiche . . . non lavorò mai opera alcuna, nella quale delle cose antiche di Roma con gran studio non servisse in vasi, calzari, trofei, bandiere, cimieri, ornamento di tempo [my emphasis], abbigliamenti di portature da capo, strane fogge da dosso, armature, scimittare, spade, toghe, manti, ed altre tante cose diverse e belle, che grandissimo e sempiterno obbligo se gli debbe, per aver egli in questa parte accrescuta bellezza e ornamenti all'arte'.¹⁹⁶

This tribute by Vasari is given further validity by Benvenuto Cellini who, in his autobiography, refers to several volumes owned by Filippino's son, Giovanni Francesco, containing drawings by the painter of the best antiquities in Rome.¹⁹⁷ To date some thirteen drawings of all'antica decorative motifs have been assembled by modern scholars and

attributed to Filippino's Roman period.¹⁹⁹ A number of these display familiarity with the decoration of the Domus Aurea. On the verso of one of them, there is a clear instance of Filippino copying a narrative scene from one of the compartments on the periphery of the volta dorata. Another is inscribed in a fifteenth-century hand - soto al chulasao - a reference to an underground passage under the Coliseum and thus in the vicinity of the Domus Aurea. Others show ornamental candelabra similar to those employed by Filippino in the Carafa chapel, with their arrangement of one decorative object sustained by another, typical of antique interior decoration. Although no drawings of the marine creatures on the Virgin's tomb (Pl. 45) or the painted dado (Pl. 76) survive, there is in this group a drawing of a nereid and another of a centaur.²⁰⁰ In general terms, these drawings display an interest in the fantastic detail and rhythmic form of this type of ornament rather than a desire to present a precise archaeological record.

A similar intention is apparent in the decoration of the fictive piers in the Carafa chapel. Amidst this varied and complex ornament, there are, however, several motifs which appear to have a symbolic content. The olive branch - a symbol of peace - is seen within an object associated with naval military power (Pl. 75). On the altar wall are pairs of bound captives who frame an oval medallion, which shows a female figure with a torch in her raised left hand, with a sacrificial bull beside her and facing a bound captive (Pl. 77).²⁰⁰ Such use of imagery employed in ancient art to denote military victory and religious sacrifice must have been calculated. References to ancient ceremonial practices associated with victory provide a foil to the theme of

Christian victory spelt out by the subjects of the paintings on the chapel's walls. This impression is enhanced further by the contrast set up between the grisaille and the rich vibrant colours of the murals - a contrast reminiscent of North European winged altarpieces. This message of the old order yielding to the new is further enhanced by the capitals on the altar wall being worked as classical, military trophies and being surmounted by the papal keys and the patron's personal emblem of an olive branch arranged in a classicising urn (Pl. 78). The painted architectural framework thus shows a recognition by both artist and patron of the decorative and symbolic potential of antique ornament. Nowhere is this understanding of ancient motifs, and recognition of their relevance to the religious practice of the day, seen better than in the adjacent tomb chamber.

The tomb chamber

With the rediscovery of Carafa's tomb chamber, the instructions given in his will (1509) that his body should be 'laid in the ecclesiastical tomb beside my chapel of the blessed Mary and Saint Thomas Aquinas', were clarified. A door in the wall of the south transept, beside the thirteenth-century tomb monument of Bishop Durandus of Mende, now provides access via a short passage to a narrow chamber covered by a barrel vault. Geiger, in her reconstruction of the original arrangement of the chapel and tomb chamber, makes the plausible proposal that access to the latter was by a narrow door that pierced the east wall of the chapel (Fig. 1).²⁰¹ One side of the tomb chamber vault has been removed in order to accommodate Paul IV's tomb in the adjacent chapel. As a

result, one border of the vault decoration has been lost and three of the stucco compartments halved. In addition, the section nearest to the present entrance has lost most of its painted decoration (Pl. 23).

The surface of the vault is embellished by a stucco framework composed of interlocking tondi and rectangles and worked in a pattern of rosettes and egg and dart moulding. A painted outer border displays a Mudéjar pattern of gold on black. The similarity to the decoration of the vault near the octagonal room in the Domus Aurea, known in the fifteenth century as the volta degli stucchi, is particularly striking.²⁰²

The areas between the stucco-work are painted either with images of a heraldic nature (Fig. 2, A, B), narrative scenes (a'-4, b'-4), or grotesques (A'-3, B'). In the central tondo (A), is Carafa's coat of arms, now barely visible, but orientated towards the main chapel. Around it is a garland of cherub heads and a sequence of glass carafes tied together by a string of delicate crystal beads (Pl. 79). In the other tondo (B), an angel supports the Carafa impresa of the book. Glass carafes also feature in this tondo, but now contain olive branches. A shield and quiver hang from one of them (Pl. 80). It is very likely that the tondo on the opposite side of the vault (C), would have shown an angel with Carafa's other impresa of the stadera. Clearly, these painted tondi were intended as a means of identification and remembrance of the person who was to be buried in this tomb chamber.

Around the tondi are a series of narrative paintings, all classical in subject matter. The four scenes set around the central tondo portray

the rites of animal sacrifice as practised in Antiquity. The composition of these paintings suggest a sequence beginning from the spectator's point of view in the lower right hand corner and progressing in a clockwise direction. In the first scene, a series of male figures in antique dress and carrying military standards are led in a procession by a piper. This procession continues in the next badly damaged compartment (a¹, a²). Next a sacrificial bull is led behind a priest who is correctly portrayed as veiled (a³, Pl. 23). In the fourth scene, another bull is depicted at the point of receiving the blow of an axe from the victimarius (a⁴, Pl. 81).

Around the second tondo, a set of four narrative paintings depict the legend of the Roman heroine, Virginia, as related by Livy in his Ab urbe condita.²⁰³ These events took place sometime in the fifth-century B. C., when Virginia, daughter of the high-minded centurion Lucius Verginius, and betrothed to Lucius Icilius, was propositioned by the decemvir, Appius Claudius, whose advances she indignantly rejected. Appius Claudius then arranged that she be claimed as a slave by his client, Marcus Claudius. Following the same clockwise sequence as the other series, the first painting shows Marcus Claudius arriving in Rome to follow out Appius Claudius' instructions (b¹). In the next scene, the plebeians are shown coming to Virginia's rescue by chasing him from the Roman forum (b²). The third scene shows Virginia before a tribunal presided over by Appius Claudius with Marcus Claudius in attendance (these two figures now barely visible). The weeping woman is undoubtedly Virginia's maid and the young man, Lucius Icilius (b³). In the last painting, Virginia's death at the hand of her father, who

preferred her death to her dishonour, is graphically portrayed (b⁴, Pl. 82).

Since the theme of these narrative paintings is both classical in origin and centres on the sacrifice of an innocent victim, it can be assumed that the destroyed scenes around the third tondo were of a similar nature. The story of Lucretia, who, like Virginia, was generally admired in the Renaissance as an example of chaste virtue, would be the most likely choice.

In the other compartments are a number of hybrid motifs. In the rectangular areas around the central tondo are objects which owe their derivation to antique grotesques (A¹⁻³, Pl. 23). In the compartment to the right of the second tondo is a mysterious motif of a lion who seems to be stirring the contents of a bowl while pouring something from an amphora (B¹, Pl. 23). Above, in another compartment, is a female nude whose feet balance on the back of a dolphin but whose arms take the form of tendrils of foliage which support yet another carafe (Pl. 83). In a corner compartment is another woman, semi-draped and seated beside a bare tree. She holds an olive twig and a heavily pruned branch (Pl. 23). In a compartment outside the outer border is an eagle with a serpent in its beak and a thunderbolt in its talons (B², Pl. 23).

The dependence of the design of the vault, with its stucco-work and painted decoration, on the Domus Aurea supports Vasari's statement that its conception was due to Filippino Lippi. As indicated above, a number of drawings by Filippino provide ample testimony of his awareness and

appreciation of this newly discovered source of antique interior decoration. However, the style of the paintings in the tomb chamber is very different from that of the murals in the main chapel. The figures, while lively in demeanour, lack the monumentality and dramatic presence of the others. The perspective has also been treated in a rather rudimentary fashion. Vasari attributes the tomb chamber paintings to Raffaellino del Garbo. Indeed, in his biography of this artist he offers a further assessment of these paintings : 'nella Minerva, intorno alla sepoltura del cardinale Caraffa, v'e quel cielo della volta tanto fine, che par fatta da miniatori onde fa tenuta degli artefici in gran pregio'.²⁰⁴ Vasari's observations on the similarity of these paintings to book illustrations and on the finesse of their execution are very astute. Given that he himself owned drawings by Raffaellino del Garbo and was well acquainted with Raffaellino's pupil, Bronzino, Vasari's attribution can be taken on trust.²⁰⁵

Vasari, however, remains silent on the subject matter and meaning of these paintings, which in the context of a Christian tomb monument are somewhat unusual. Clearly Raffaellino had been attentive to antique sources. For the scenes of the procession and sacrifice, there were a number of sculptural models in Rome to which he could have turned. While the painter shows a knowledge of the correct costume and implements used on such occasions, he does not seem to have followed any one model but improvised freely from such sources as were available to him.²⁰⁶

The narrative cycle of Virginia incorporates figures in antique costume within classical settings. For example, a pyramid and triumphal column figure in the scene of Marcus Claudius' arrival (Pl. 23). Certain of the poses are also reminiscent of antique narrative reliefs. However, the figurative style lacks the monumentality of such models, and is more akin to that of fifteenth-century cassone painting.

Due to the condition of the vault, any proposal as to the meaning of its painted programme must remain tentative. However, its function as the ceiling decoration for a funerary monument provides a crucial clue. As mentioned above, its shape is reminiscent of a barrel-vaulted entrance passage, similar in design to the painted feature behind the Archangel Gabriel in the altarpiece of the main chapel (cf. Pls. 23, 40). Its architectural design, therefore, acts as a powerful symbol for the gateway to heaven. As if to further emphasise this symbolic function, the first painted motif on the vault itself is an eagle with a serpent in its beak and a thunderbolt in its talons (Pl. 23). In ancient Rome, the eagle, a symbol of Jupiter's domination of the skies, had been adopted as a symbol of supreme imperial power and apotheosis. Similarly, the serpent was used as a symbol for the apotheosis of the soul after death. These creatures, therefore, figured frequently in classical art where such a message was deemed apposite.²⁰⁷ In Christian art, the eagle continued to be employed as a symbol of apotheosis (and more specifically as a symbol for Saint John the Evangelist²⁰⁸) while the serpent took on the guise of Satan. Clearly, this image of a serpent held in the eagle's grasp could be interpreted in Christian terms as an allegory of the triumph over the powers of evil and death. The

probability that this motif was included in the tomb chamber because of such connotations is strengthened by the fact that it also appears in the carved decoration of Carafa's second funerary chapel in Naples cathedral (Pl. 92).²⁰⁹

The two surviving tondi indicate, and draw attention to, the individual buried beneath this vault by including not only the cardinal's coat of arms but also other objects which refer both to his name and to the emblems adopted by him. In addition, other aspects of Carafa's reputation may be alluded to in the painted series of Virginia. In Petrarch's Trionfi, Virginia features as one of the heroines in the Triumph of Chastity and, in the 1499 Florentine edition, Verginius is one of the heroes in the Triumph of Fame.²¹⁰ Two such representatives of the virtues of chastity and fame would be doubly appropriate within the context of a funerary monument for a high-ranking ecclesiastic like Carafa.

The story of Virginia also involved the death of an innocent victim, which constituted an important feature of the rites of ancient sacrifice as portrayed in the four scenes around the central tondo (Pls. 23, 82). In the fifteenth century, this particular aspect of pagan ritual had been allegorised as a symbolic enactment of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross.²¹¹ The theme of death, with these further connotations of the redemptive powers of Christ's sacrifice on mankind's behalf, was highly suitable for the painted decoration of a burial chamber.

The remaining imagery and its meaning are more problematic. Bertelli has proposed that the woman on the back of the dolphin is Fortuna (Pl. 83), and the lion, a creature engaged in the preparation of diabolic mystery cults. Geiger suggests Minerva for the woman with the olive branch, and Temperance for the lion.²¹² In view of the clear derivation of these motifs from the decorative repertoire of the Domus Aurea, they should be seen, at the very least, as a means of extending this highly self-conscious stylistic analogy, while also providing graceful adjuncts to the patron's personal symbols of the glass carafe and olive branch.

The chapel's function

Once the painted programme was completed, the Carafa chapel took on a number of different ecclesiastical functions. From the papal bull promulgated on 14 June, 1493, by Alexander VI, it is clear that Carafa had provided both a sufficient endowment to finance the regular performance of requiem masses in his chapel, and also the requisite paramenta for such liturgical ceremony.²¹³ Certain of these items are described in his last will and testament. Listed as specifically for use in his chapel in the Minerva are: a small silver cross and two silver candlesticks for the altar; three embroidered pallia; a pluvial with white embroidery; a planeta, dalmatic and tunicle (these vestments already presented to the chapel); a planeta embroidered with peacocks; a planeta, with black dalmatic and tunicle for the celebration of the office of the dead; two large tapestries decorated with his stemma and Adam and Eve, for use on the feasts of the Annunciation, Birth of the Virgin and Saint Thomas Aquinas.²¹⁴

From this list, it appears that Carafa, as the founder of the chapel, had already supplied the vestments for the priest, deacon and sub-deacon, and that he wished further to donate another set for the office of the dead to be celebrated in his honour.²¹⁵

The reference to the bequest of two tapestries,²¹⁶ and their use for three specially designated feast days, is particularly interesting because it confirms the information given in the papal bull as to the significance of these feasts for the chapel and its patron. The subject of Adam and Eve would suggest that each of these tapestries would have been of narrow dimensions, suitable for display on the entrance pilasters of the chapel. These textile representations of the principal actors in the Fall of Man would have added a further dimension to the chapel's iconographic programme, since one of the Virgin Mary's title is the Second Eve, whose co-operation in the mystery of the Incarnation made possible a remission of the consequences of Original Sin.²¹⁷

From Burchard's record, it is clear that from 1493 onwards the Carafa chapel played a regular part in the annual calendar of the papal chapel. On the feast of the Annunciation in 1493 and 1504, the reigning pope visited the cardinal's chapel after the ceremony of the presentation of the dowries to the young girls.²¹⁸ In the case of the feast of Thomas Aquinas, Burchard provides evidence that, before 1498, the ceremonial for that day took place in the choir and chancel of the Minerva with only the cardinals and not the pope in attendance. The most important aspects of the ceremony were the singing of the Creed, the delivery of a sermon and the announcement of a plenary indulgence. On 7 March, 1498,

however, Burchard describes a high mass celebrated in the choir of the church, a sermon given by 'Lippo' Brandolino, and a visit to the chapel of the Cardinal of Naples. On 6 March, 1499, another reference is made to the high mass in the Minerva, and a visit to the chapel, 'built for the Cardinal of Naples' pomp and glory'. Similarly in 1500 and 1502, the ceremonies on the feast day of this saint were concluded by a visit to Carafa's chapel.²¹⁹

As has been indicated in chapter three above, there is convincing evidence that Carafa actively promoted the feast day of the saint in a number of other ways. Burchard's successor, Paris de Grassis, in his appendix of directives on the correct procedure for the ceremonial practices of the papal chapel, pays fulsome tribute to the cardinal's efforts to establish certain ceremonial rituals on Aquinas' feast day.²²⁰ Moreover, the survival of a number of the sermons composed by curial humanists in honour of Aquinas and delivered in the Minerva on his feast day, provide further testimony of the guiding hand of a powerful patron.²²¹

Burchard also gives accounts of the celebration of high mass within the Carafa chapel on the feast of the Birth of the Virgin on 8 September, 1497 and 1499. (In September, 1498, Carafa was in Naples.) From his description of the ceremony in 1497, it appears that, apart from Carafa and his household, the cardinal bishops were in attendance together with three archbishops and the ambassador of the King of England. All these important dignataries were accomodated on benches in the chapel itself, whereas the friars were placed in the transept. A public sermon was

given by a friar from a pulpit in the church. A procession was then staged in the church with mass celebrated at the altar of the Carafa chapel. At the end of the ceremony, a copy of Alexander VI's bull granting a plenary indulgence was placed on the church door. The events of the ceremony in 1499 followed a similar pattern, although on this occasion Carafa was provided with a prie-dieu and a stool with two cushions - a striking similarity to the furnishings sculpted on his life-size portrait statue in his chapel in Naples (Pl. 96).²²²

From these accounts, it is obvious that, due to Carafa's powerful position as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order, the chapel of the Annunziata and Saint Thomas Aquinas in the Minerva soon had a place in the liturgical calendar of the papal chapel as high as any religious location outside the Vatican at that time.

Conclusion

While it is likely that members of the Dominican hierarchy of Santa Maria sopra Minerva would have been consulted, the nature of the subject matter of the painted programme in the Carafa chapel and its treatment suggest that Cardinal Oliviero Carafa himself played a major part in its composition. The imagery is too focused on his personal preoccupations to argue otherwise.

Both chapel and tomb chamber are embellished with the Carafa coat of arms, executed in either paint, stucco or marble at key points in the

decorative scheme (Pls. 15, 19, 26, 79). It has even been included within the painted imagery of the altarpiece (Pl. 40). Coupled with the armorial device of the Carafa family are plentiful images of his personal imprese, the book and stadera, which refer symbolically to the virtues of wisdom and justice which, we know from contemporary testimony, he sought to espouse (Pls. 22, 25). Such is the logic of the programme that on the pavement, the tondo with the book, which has been embellished further with rays of light, is placed on the side towards the wall devoted to Aquinas' deeds, thereby drawing a parallel between the cardinal's personal emblem and the inspired scholarship of the saint. Conversely the tondo with the stadera appears beside the wall which was once embellished with personifications of Virtues meeting out justice to their adversaries (Pl. 26). In the ribs of the vault, the emblem of the book has been worked into the design (Pl. 19) and it figures prominently in one of the painted tondi of the tomb chamber (Pl. 80). The altarpiece, vault and murals on the west wall, all include books, thereby extending the iconography of these paintings (Pls. 17, 38, 41; 19, 27; 20, 52; 21, 57, 58).

In addition to these personal imprese, olive branches and delicate glass carafes have been included both within the painted murals and their framework (Pls. 41, 78, 79, 80, 83). These were clearly intended to allude both to the names of the founder and to the virtues of chastity and purity. As in the case of wisdom, the celebration of such qualities was particularly apposite for the painted programme of a chapel dedicated to the Virgin Annunciate and Saint Thomas Aquinas - doctor and virgin (Pls. 17, 20, 21).

The principal subject matter of the chapel's murals is clearly pertinent to the two dedicatees of the chapel, yet it also includes a personal dimension for the patron. The Marian imagery of the Annunziata has been further extended to embrace that of the Assunta (Pl. 14) with its association of triumph over death, thus acknowledging the designated function of the chapel and adjacent tomb chamber as a burial place for Carafa. On the altarpiece, the focal point of any chapel's painted scheme, Carafa is also seen in close proximity to both the Annunziata and Saint Thomas Aquinas (Pls. 17, 38), thereby making a considerable claim for his status and commemorating in powerful visual terms his act of devotion.

In the case of the themes selected to celebrate Saint Thomas Aquinas, they emphasise the saint's especial sanctity as doctor communis and angelicus (Pls. 20, 21). Since Carafa had inaugurated a special celebration in the chapel on the saint's feast day, when the reciting of the office would make a clear allusion to this double honour, the significance of the choice of subject matter becomes all the more pointed.

As demonstrated in the discussion of the chapel's painted murals, they represent an innovatory reworking of the traditional iconography for their various subjects. Repeatedly Carafa's personal and official preoccupations supply an explanation either for the introduction of relatively unusual subjects (Pl. 19) or peculiar details within them (Pls. 69, 71).

Finally, the confident inclusion of all'antica imagery within the context of a Christian monument also points to the active direction of the patron concerned. Even if the painter had been allowed to design the painted architectural framework (Pl. 72) according to his own whim, he certainly would not have been given a free range when choosing the subject matter of the painted vault of the chamber (Pl. 23). As has been seen, the choice of classical subjects could be justified as an allegory on the themes of death and the virtues to be espoused in preparation for death. Circumstantial evidence further suggests that Carafa may well have directed Filippino and his assistants towards suitable antique models which they could emulate.

While the chapel with its painted programme is thus focused keenly on Carafa's personal concerns, it also had a much more public role than many privately owned Renaissance chapels. On three feast days it had a part to play in the ceremonial of the papal chapel, and on two of these, it had been granted a plenary indulgence to all who visited it. It was also one of the largest chapels in one of the principal churches in Italy of the Dominican Order, a religious order which, as recent scholarship indicates,²²³ was particularly committed to the use of imagery as an aid to devotion. Carafa, as Cardinal Bishop of Sabina and Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order, apparently engineered this highly public profile in order to serve the interests of the Roman Church and the Dominican Order. Fortunately, he was astute enough to follow Lorenzo de'Medici's recommendation to employ, as master-in-charge of this project, Filippino Lippi, a painter whose abilities were of a quality to supply painted imagery that was robust enough in overall

impact and sufficiently intriguing in detail to sustain this public role.

Notes to Chapter 4

¹See the plan in the Guida d'Italia del Touring Club Italiano: Roma e dintorni (hereafter T.C.I.), (2nd. ed., Milan, 1977), p. 183. The Carafa chapel is marked no. 8 on the plan. The chapel interior is 7.17 m. wide, 6.17 m. deep, the height of the vault 11.83 m. from floor to crown.

²DIVAE MARIAE VIRGINI ANNUNTIATAE ET DIVO THOME AQUINAT. SACRUM.

³See above chapter 1, note 1.

⁴The text of the bull is published in Bullarium ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, III, p. 99. There are, however, a number of words missing in this source, so all quotations from this bull are taken from the inscription in the chapel itself.

⁵Between 25 March, 1493, and 25 March, 1504, Burchard makes ten specific references to the 'Cardinal of Naples' chapel' in the Minerva and its part in the liturgies of the papal chapel. See Liber notarum, I, pp. 411, 596-7, 598; II, pp. 53, 75, 130, 163, 207, 321, 442. These celebrations took place on either the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas (7 Mar.) the Annunciation (25 Mar.) or the Birth of the Virgin (8 Sept.). For further discussion, see below, pp. 188-9, 250-2.

⁶Paris de Grassis, 'Clalerimoniarium', fol. 319^r: 'sive interventu r[e]verendissim[i] d[omi]ni Oliverii Caraffae, ep[iscop]i Ostien[sis], Cardinalis Neapolitani, viri undecumque exemplaris et ompraesentiarum dicti ordinis protectoris qui etiam ibi sacellum cultu et decore spectabile in honorem numinis illius exstruxit'.

⁷Cortesi, De cardinalatu, 'De domo cardinalis', Liber II, cap. II, fol. 54^r: 'Aut quale illud Oliverii Carraphae Senatoris videri debet quod est in Minervae delubro ingeniosa argumentorum ratione pictum'. See also the translation and discussion of this passage in The Renaissance cardinal's ideal palace: a chapter from Cortesi's De cardinalatu, trans. K. Weil-Garris and J. F. d'Amico (Rome, 1980), p. 92.

⁸F. Albertini, Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae (Rome, 1510), printed by Jacopo Mazzocchi, fol. 85^r: 'In ecclesia S. Mariae super minervam est capella in honorem Virg[inis] Mariae & beati Thomae de Aquino constructa ac dotata a Reveren[di]ssim[o] Oliverio Carapha Card[in]alis Neapolit[an]o ep[iscop]o Hostien[sis] quam Philippus alterius Philippi de Lippis pictor excellentiss[im]us Flor[entia]e mira arte depinxit, ut op[er]a eius Flor[entia]e in templo divae Ma[ria]e Novellae demonstrant'.

⁹L. Alberti O. P., De viris illustribus ordinis Praedicatorum (Bologna, 1517), p. 83: 'Sacellu[m] politissimu[m] et sculptura et pictura elaboratu[m] in dicto te[m]plo Deiparae Virgini, et divo Thomas Aquinatis erexit'.

¹⁰G. Vasari, Le vite de più eccellenti architetti pittori et scultori italiani (Florence, 1550), printed by L. Torrentino, pp. 516-517.

¹¹Vasari-Milanesi, III, pp. 467-9.

¹²See, for example, G. D. Franzini, Descrizione di Roma antica e moderna (Rome, 1643), p. 153; Martinelli, Roma ricercata, p. 239; G. Roisecco, Roma antica e moderna (Rome, 1750), II, p. 502; F. Titi, Descrizione delle pitture, sculture ed architetture esposte al pubblico in Roma (Rome, 1763), I, p. 158.

¹³J. J. Berthier, L'église de la Minerve à Rome (Rome, 1910), pp. 195-6: 'La chapelle existe encore. Elle est à côté de la chapelle de Saint Thomas, et la porte, à peine visible, se trouve sous le monument de Durand de Mende'.

¹⁴Scharf, Filippino Lippi, pp. 39-40.

¹⁵K. Neilson, Filippino Lippi: a critical study (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), p. 83.

¹⁶C. Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', Il Veltrò, VII (1963), pp. 55-65; *ibid.*, 'Il restauro della Cappella Carafa in Santa Maria sopra Minerva a Roma', Bollettino dell'Istituto centrale del restauro, XLII (1965), pp. 145-195; *ibid.*, 'Appunti sugli affreschi nella Cappella Carafa alla Minerva', AFP, XXXV (1965), pp. 115-130.

¹⁷On 9 April, 1566, the notary, Girolamo di Tarano, recorded the order to construct this tomb, see Rome, Archivio di Stato, Notari, Segretari e Cancellieri della R.C.A., 464, Atti Notarili di Girolamo Tarano, published by F. Cerasoli, 'Il monumento di Paolo IV nella chiesa della Minerva', Studi e documenti di storia e diritto, XL (1894), pp. 1-4. The tomb was designed by Pirro Ligorio with the statue of the deceased by Giacomo Cassignola. It once incorporated two reclining figures of Faith and Religion whose poses appear to derive from the painted sibyls in the vault. These two statues are now located in the vestibule leading to the sacristy of the church. For photographs of these statues, see Anderson Roma 20699, 20700. Above the tomb is a lunette window which is probably larger than the original window on the east wall of the chapel. The lighting conditions in the chapel are therefore different now to what they were in the late fifteenth century.

¹⁸Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 470: 'dove fece, per il detto cardinale, una sepoltura di stucchi; e di gesso, in spartimento della detta chiesa, una cappellina allato a quella, ed altre figure; delle quali Raffaellino del Garbo, suo discepolo, ne lavorò alcune'.

¹⁹Bertelli, 'Il restauro', pp. 152-4, 168.

²⁰On Sunday, 4 March, 1725, Francesco Valesio, notes in his diary (published by V. Gozio, 'Notizie sull'arte romana del Settecento tratte dal Diario del Valerio', Archivi d'Italia, XVI (1936), pp. 119-125),

that Monsignor Carafa had restored the chapel, with the frescoes being cleaned and a new altar consecrated by the Pope [Benedict XIII].

²¹G. L. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel (cf. my review in Art History, X (1987), pp. 532-541). See also her 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa Annunciation'; 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas', in Rome in the Renaissance, ed. P. A. Ramsey (Binghamton, New York, 1982), pp. 224-236; 'Filippino Lippi's Wunder des heiligen Thomas von Aquin im Rom des späten Quattrocento', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XLVII (1984), pp. 247-260.

²²Ibid., Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 49-52.

²³Archivio di Stato, Notari Capitolini, 499, fols. 21^v-22^r. The document is summarised in 'Campione o sia generale descrizione di tutte le scritture spettanti al venerabile convento di S. Maria sopra Minerva di Roma', compiled in 1725 by Giacomo Reginaldo Quadri, Minerva Archives, MS 1, fols. 152-3: 'concessione, o sia concessione fatta dal convento della Minerva a Domenico Beneaccaduto della 3a Parte di un Casalino contiguo alla Chiesa della Minerva demolito dal Card[inale] Oliveri Caraffa [per] . . . ampliare . . . la Cappela'. Published in Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, 'Appendix', doc. 1.

²⁴Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 151.

²⁵Although the vaults over the nave were carried out as late as 1453-1468, those in the transept were completed by the end of the fourteenth century. See P. Tomei, L'architettura a Roma nel Quattrocento (Rome, 1942), pp. 45-7; L. Heydenreich and W. Lotz, Architecture in Italy 1400 to 1600 (Harmondsworth, 1974), p. 54; G. Urban, 'Die Kirchenbaukunst des Quattrocento in Rom', Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, IX-X (1961-1962), pp. 73-287, esp. 119-124.

²⁶The statues of the young boys on the arch do not belong to the original scheme (Pl. 14). A. Venturi, Storia dell'arte italiana (Milan, 1923), VIII, 1, p. 373, attributes them to Benedetto da Maiano. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 28, n.7, suggests that they might be from Old Saint Peter's and from the workshop of Luigi Capponi.

²⁷The views of Santa Maria sopra Minerva provided by the maps of Stefano Dupérac (1577), Giovanni Maggi (1625) reprinted by Carlo Losi (1774), Giovanni Battista Falda (1676), in A. P. Frutaz, Le piante di Roma, (3 vols, Rome, 1962), no. CXXVII, tav. 250; no. CXLVII, tav. 315; no. CLVIII, tav. 367, all show the south arm of the church boxed in by housing. The chapel has a crypt which is too low for burial.

²⁸See above, chapter 2, pp. 46-7. The letter itself is transcribed in Appendix II.

²⁹MAP XLVI, no. 556: 'haviamo donato l[ettere], et lice[n]tia a m[ae]stro philippo n[ost]ro, con el quale havemo concluso e contractato l'opera . . . q[u]al[is] . . . legimo . . . che m[ae]stro philippo n[ost]ro car[is]simo no[n] fusse da sui emuli supplantato . . . Sed

modice fidei, quia n[on] dubitasti'. For the full context of this statement see below, Appendix II.

³⁰MAP XL, no. 385: 'Saram due lettere del Cardinale di Napoli al Abbati di Mazinghi es a visto e co[n]clusione di Filippo dipintor a noster recomentazione egli parti di iere mattina id. 100 ducce'. Published in Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, 'Appendix', doc. 4, see also her remarks on the significance of this letter, *ibid.*, p. 45, and Scharf's reference to it, Filippino Lippi, p. 6.

³¹Scharf, *ibid.*, doc. 11, pp. 90-1. See also above chapter 2, p. 47 and note 81.

³²Borsook, 'Documents', p. 738, n.20. By the end of the fifteenth century, in Rome, the gold ducat della camera was roughly equal in value to the large gold florin introduced in Florence in the mid-fifteenth century. See R. Roover, Rise and decline of the Medici bank 1397-1494 (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), pp. 31-4; Ullman, 'Italian cardinals', 'Appendix', pp. 169-170.

³³See above, chapter 2, note 140.

³⁴See above, chapter 2, note 141.

³⁵Bertelli, 'Il restauro', pp. 150, 151, 157, 159, 162, 176.

³⁶Borsook, 'Documents', p. 738 n.20, 21; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 38.

³⁷See below, chapter 5, pp. 293-6.

³⁸See above, chapter 2, pp. 69-74.

³⁹Neilson, Filippino Lippi, p. 81. For a photograph of this monument, see Anderson Roma 5795.

⁴⁰Vasari-Milanesi, IV, pp. 467-8.

⁴¹This aspect of Carafa's patronage is discussed in further detail below, chapter 6, pp. 348-51.

⁴²This sarcophagus stands against the entrance wall and has been dated 164-82 A. D. It owes its preservation to its incorporation into the tomb of Cardinal Guglielmo Fieschi (d. 1256). It was much drawn and engraved in the Renaissance. See Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, no. 196, pp. 229-230. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 182, n.47, sees an analogy between the Carafa masks and the heads on the capitals of Donatello's Calvacanti Annunciation. In my view, the arrangement of the two masks seen in profile on the Roman sarcophagus is much closer to that of the Carafa altarpiece frame.

⁴³The text of the will is published in E. Strutt, Era Filippo Lippi (London, 1901), p. 183, doc. XII.

⁴⁴Strozziane, V, 44, fol. 75. These payments have been published in Borsook, 'Documents', pp. 803-4, docs. 65, 66.

⁴⁵Scharf, Filippino Lippi, pp. 7, 39-40.

⁴⁶Sale, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel, pp. 149-152, argues that on grounds of style, the portrayal of Adam in the Strozzi vault is close to a number of figures in the Carafa chapel. He therefore proposes that Filippino completed one compartment of the Strozzi vault in autumn, 1489, before returning to Rome. D. Friedman, 'The burial chamber of Filippo Strozzi in Santa Maria Novella', L'arte, IX (1970), pp. 108-131, esp. 116-8, argues conversely that Adam, Noah and Jacob were executed in a single early campaign. I. H. Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman' (PhD. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975), pp. 14-15, sees the preparatory sketches for the Strozzi chapel as homogeneous in style, and therefore argues for a single campaign of work on the Strozzi cycle after the completion of the Carafa project. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 65, sees Noah and Jacob as most closely resembling the three original Carafa sibyls. I am basically in agreement with those scholars who feel that Filippino completed part of the Strozzi vault in 1489 before returning to Rome. Abraham is more closely akin to earlier examples of Florentine vault figures and could, therefore, have conceivably been painted in this initial campaign. The pose of Noah is analogous to the Cumaeen sibyl, and that of Jacob to the Tiburtine sibyl. On purely stylistic grounds which derives from which is difficult to determine.

⁴⁷Bertelli, 'Appunti', p. 116.

⁴⁸'Co[n]fisi o[mn]ib[us] et sing[ull]is utriusq[ue] sexus [Christi] fidelib[us] vere penitentib[us] et co[n]fess[is] qui cappella[m] predicta[m] ad qua[m] nos pe[r]sonalite[r] pro n[ost]ra devotione accessim[us] in navitat[e] eiusd[em] s[an]cte M[arie] et ip[s]ius S[an]cti Thome festivatib[us] a primis vesperis usq[ue] as occasu[m] solis diei sequentis singular[um] festivatatum earunde[m] devot[e] visativerint an[n]uatim plenariu[m] omnium suoru[m] peccatoru[m] de quibus corde contriti et ore confessi fuerint indulgentia[m] et remissione[m] auctoritate apostolica tenore p[re]sentium elargimur p[re]sentibus p[er]petuis futuris temporib[us] valitur[is].'

⁴⁹Burchard, Liber notarum I, p. 411: 'Quo facto, pontifex fecit orationem in faldistorio ante altare; deinde, deposito pluviale et mitra, reassumpto capucino sub stola, venit ad capellam novam Annunciate per r. d. cardinalem Neapolitanum factum'. Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa "Annunciation"', p. 62, n.1, is the first to note the reference made by Burchard to the chapel.

⁵⁰See Scharf, Filippino Lippi, p. 49; Neilson, Filippino Lippi, pp. 112-3; Sale, Filippo Strozzi's chapel, p. 125.

⁵¹See Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', p. 63; M. G. Carpaneto, 'Raffaellino del Garbo', Antichità viva, IX (1970) 4, pp. 3-23, esp. pp. 8-11; X (1971), 1, pp. 3-19. The style of the

decoration and its authorship is discussed in further detail below, pp. 242-9.

⁵²See below, chapter 5, p. 293.

⁵³The painted vault in the chapel of Nicholas V in the Vatican, executed c. 1447-1450, is more typical of this tradition, as indeed are Filippino Lippi's four patriarchs in the vault of the Strozzi chapel. For photographs of these painted vaults, see Anderson *Roma* 7498, Alinari *Firenze* 4040-3.

⁵⁴Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, in J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae series Latina*, Vol. XXIII (Paris, 1883), p. 270, praises the sibyls as exemplary women of antiquity who were symbols of virginity. See also Geiger, *Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel*, p. 67.

⁵⁵Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, I, ch. 6, pp. 33-5; IV, chs. 6, p. 256, 13, p. 275, 18, pp. 293-9; VII, ch. 24, pp. 532-3. *The "Summa theologica" of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (22 vols., 2nd rev. ed., London, 1920-32) Vol. XXIV, p. 31 (II-II 172.6): 'wherefore also the sibyls foretold many true things about Christ'. For Augustine's view of the sibyls, see above, chapter 3, note 22.

⁵⁶The Carafa *Cumaeen sibyl* displays a text taken from Virgil *Eclogue* IV, l. 7. See *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid*, trans. H. Fairclough (2 vols, London, 1929) I, p. 29. Geiger, *Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel*, p. 68, further associates the Delphic and Hellespontine sibyls with Troy the city from whence Aeneas fled. Useful summaries of the sibyls' history and treatment in medieval and Renaissance art are to be found in E. Mâle, *L'art religieux de la fin du moyen âge en France* (Paris, 1908), pp. 268-293; E. Wind, 'Michelangelo's prophets and sibyls', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, LI (1965), pp. 47-84.

⁵⁷See above, chapter 3, pp. 105-6.

⁵⁸Barbieri, *Opuscula*. The following table sets out the inscriptions given to the Carafa sibyls against those given in the first 1488 edition of this treatise:

Delphic sibyl:	PROPHETA EX VIRGINI NASCETUR.
Barbieri, fol. 8 ^r	Nasci debere p[ro]phetam absq[ue] coytu ex virgine eius.
Cumaeen sibyl:	IAM NOVA PROGENIES C[ae]LELO DIMITTIT[ur] ALTO
Barbieri, fol. 10 ^v	Iam nova progenies c[ae]lelo dimittitur alto.
Hellespontine sibyl:	JESUS CHRISTUS NASC[et]ur DE CASTA.
Barbieri, fol. 10 ^v	Ihesus xp[istu]s nascet[ur] de casta.
Tiburtine sibyl:	NASCETUR CHRISTUS IN BETALE[HE]M.
Barbieri, fol. 12 ^r	Nascetur Christus in bethlehem.

⁵⁹The inscription on the Hellespontine sibyl's tablet: 'FLUMINA/ TUNC [sic]/ LACT/IS TUNC [sic]/ FLUMINA/ NETTA/RIS/ IB[er]A[V]NT[sic]', derives from Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes*, Bk. I, ch. 6 (Eng. trans. p. 533, where the author refers to 'yet another sibyl' and her prophecy that: 'the holy earth alone having reverence will see all these

things; the streams from the honey dripping rocks and from the water fountains sweet nectar will flow for all mortals'. Given Carafa's probable ownership of a MS copy of this work, it is possible that the seventeenth-century repainting preserved the original inscriptions. The other text held by the angel on our left is the acrostic which Augustine credited to the Erythraean sibyl: 'IESUS/ CHRIS/TUS/ DEI/ FILIUS/ SERVA/TOR'. See above, chapter 3, note 22.

⁶⁰As noted by D. Covi, 'Lettering in fifteenth-century Florentine painting', Art Bulletin, XLV (1963), pp. 1-17, esp. p. 14, and n.14, the style of lettering in the late fifteenth century often tends to assume an iconographic function, and also the tablets on which the Carafa sibyls' names are displayed are in the form of tabula ansata commonly used for inscriptions on Roman sarcophagi. For this taste in classical epigraphy and its emergence as an enjoyable intellectual pastime, see R. Weiss, The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity (Oxford, 1969), pp. 145-166; Stinger, Renaissance in Rome, pp. 63-4.

⁶¹In the second edition (Rome, 1482) also printed by Lignamine, Barbieri adds descriptions of the sibyls' costumes and personal appearance. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 19263). Here, ibid., fol. 13^r, the Delphic sibyl is described with bound tresses (capillis circumligatis) and Filippino's Delphic sibyl also has a mass of luxuriant hair bound in ribbons (Pl. 30).

⁶²During the fifteenth century, the sibyls tended to figure amongst the painted series of famous men and women which were designed as part of the decoration for villas and palaces. Andrea del Castagno included the Cumaeen sibyl in his cycle of c.1449-1451 for the Villa Carducci, Legnaia (Florence), see M. Horster, Andrea del Castagno (Oxford, 1980), pp. 31-2, 179-180, illus. col. pl. V. The d'Este palace of Belriguardo near Ferrara also once contained painted murals of sibyls, see W. L. Gundersheimer (ed.), Art and life at the court of Ercole I d'Este: the 'De triumphis religionis' of Sabadino degli Arienti (Geneva, 1972), pp. 19, 61. In Rome, a lost series in the Orsini palace at Monte Giordano likewise included sibyls. Give Carafa's personal connections with this family, he must have known it. Nevertheless the descriptions given in the early sources and discussed by W. A. Simpson, 'Cardinal Giordano Orsini as a prince of the Church and patron of the arts', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXIX (1966), pp. 135-159, are not sufficiently detailed to enable comparison with the Carafa sibyls.

⁶³For discussion of these sets of sibyls and their mode of representation, see A. M. Hind, Early Italian engraving (London, 1938), I, pp. 153-186; G. Cecchinni, Il pavimento della Cattedrale da Siena (Siena, n.d), passim; G. Marchini, Era Filippo Lippi (Milan, 1975), pp. 104, 215, illus. pl. 168; E. Borsook and J. Offerhaus, Francesco Sassetti and Ghirlandaio at Santa Trinita, Florence (Doornspijk, 1981), pp. 29-32, illus. pls.14-19.

⁶⁴London, British Museum, 1946-7-13-215, metalpoint on light brown prepared paper heightened with white, 129 x 110 mm. For further discussion of this drawing, see A. E. Popham and P. Pouncey, Italian

drawings in . . . the British Museum: the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (2 vols., London, 1950), cat. no. 132; Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 53, pp. 220-1.

⁶⁵Lille, Musée Wicar, 633, pen and brown ink, 81 x 144 mm.

⁶⁶ For the debate over which of the Carafa sibyls this drawing represents, see P. Pouncey's review of B. Berenson, I disegni in Master drawings, II (1964), pp. 278-93, esp. p. 286; Shoemaker, ibid., cat. no. 54, pp. 225-5; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 65-6. There is another drawing attributed to Filippino (Uffizi, 1164E, metalpoint, white heightening, traces black chalk on grey prepared paper, 138 x 165 mm.), of a woman with extended arms which is possibly an early preliminary study for one of the Carafa sibyls. See Shoemaker, ibid., cat. no. 55, pp. 226-9.

⁶⁷Neilson, Filippino Lippi, pp. 85-7.

⁶⁸For the precise details of the chronology of this sculptural commission, see L. Ettlinger, Antonio and Piero Pollaiuolo (Oxford, 1978), pp. 54, 148-9. The iconography of the tomb and its relevance for Sixtus IV and his circle is discussed in ibid., 'Pollaiuolo's tomb of Pope Sixtus IV', passim.

⁶⁹For the provenience of this statue and the Maffei collection, see Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, cat. no. 79, pp. 113-114, p. 476.

⁷⁰See above, chapter 3, pp. 127-8.

⁷¹ Burchard, Liber notarum, I, p. 226. The most crucial passage of this account runs: 'SS. D. N. sedit et faldistorium celebrantis fuit positum in plano capelle . . . coram quo quidem officialis societatis Annunciate obtulit unum bacile cum X bursis carlenis plenis, pro maritandis puellis: quarum una bursa fuit aperta et carleni in bacile sparsi ut viderentur, deinde repositi in bursam. Ium accesserunt puelle maritande, singule inter duas matronas albis vestibus indute, et genuflexe coram celebrante, capiebant ex eius manibus bursam et manum suam osculabantur; accedebant deinde ad pontificem et osculabantur ejus pedem tam puelle quam matrone'.

⁷²Burchard records Carafa's presence at five of the masses celebrated at the Minerva on the feast of the Annunciation. See ibid., I, pp. 411, 581, 598; II, pp. 132, 442. It appears that in 1498 the Annunciation was celebrated at the Minerva without the pope and cardinals despite Carafa's request that the pope visit the church. See ibid., II, p. 77. On 25 March, 1499, Carafa again tried to persuade the pope to grace the celebration but without success. He and the other cardinals did, however, attend. See ibid., II, p. 132.

⁷³Three payments, dated respectively, 12 Dec., 1499, 16 and 21 Mar., 1500 (Rome, Archivio di Stato, Archivio della Confraternità della SS Annunziata al Convento della Minerva), published in G. Noehles, 'Antoniazio Romano: Studien zur Quattrocento Malerei in Rom' (PhD).

dissertation, Münster, 1973), pp. 212-3, docs. 47-9, indicate that this altarpiece postdates Filippino's mural altarpiece. Noehles, *ibid.*, pp. 80-3, sees Antoniazio's altarpiece as typical of this painter's later style. See also his catalogue entry, no. 65, pp. 212-3, and G. Hedberg, 'Antoniazzo Romano and his school' (dissertation in fine arts, New York University, 1980), pp. 48-9, cat. no. 51, pp. 195-6. Hedberg is mistaken, however, in his assertion that the confraternity's chapel was restored by Alexander VI and Carafa in 1493 - a misreading of Forcella's record of the papal bull in the Carafa chapel.

⁷⁴The sixteenth-century Dominican Leandro Alberti, De viris illustribus, fol. 83^r, gives a fulsome acknowledgement of Torquemada's foundation of this charitable organisation and also links it to Carafa's patronage of the Minerva.

⁷⁵'Testamento', fol. [2^v]: 'Item relinquo societ[at]i anupciacionis [sic] beate Marie sup[ra]l Minervam p[ro]l maritalid[is] decem pauperib[us] puellis ducatos q[uod]ulinge[n]tos et dicta[m] societatem rogo p[er] viscera misericordie Ihesu Christi ut iusta morem in festo nativitatis Virginis Marie intersunt processioni: i[n] festo ip[s]ius nativitatis in cappella mea, ubi est indulgentia plenaria i[n] honor[e] ip[s]ius virginis [in margin] d[ucatos] quingentos'.

⁷⁶Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa Annunciation' *passim*; Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel', ch. 7, pp. 132-147.

⁷⁷Saint Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae, III, qu. 30, art. 4 (Eng. trans., 16, pp. 49-51); Le prediche volgari di San Bernardino da Siena, dette nella Piazza del Campo l'anno MCCCCXXVII, ed. L. Banchi (Siena, 1884), Vol. II, sermon XXIX, pp. 388-429; Saint Antoninus, Summa theologiae (Verona, 1740, reprint, Graz, 1959), IV, qu. 15, art. 8.

⁷⁸See, for example, Bernardino Carvajal, Oratio in die circumcissionis Domini [Rome, 1484], published by Stephanus Planck (?), fol. 15^v: 'In enim quod dicitur Emmanuel, quod interpretatur nobiscum, designatur causa nostrae salutis, quae est unio divinae et humanae naturae in persona Filii Dei, per quam actum est ut Deus esset nobiscum particeps'. See also O'Malley, 'Preaching for the popes', pp. 417-19, 430-1, 435-6; Praise and blame, p. 140.

⁷⁹The point was brought home by Charles Hope's discussion of the iconic aspect of Renaissance altarpieces in one of his unpublished Slade lectures, 'Renaissance art and its meanings', Oxford University, Hilary Term, 1986.

⁸⁰This relationship is referred to by Cajetan and Aurelio 'Lippo' Brandolino in works dedicated to Carafa. See above, chapter 3, p. 109.

⁸¹'Testamento', fol. [1^v].

⁸²Passero, Giornali, pp. 173-4: 'Oliverio Carrafa ... fece testamento, et lassai che lo cuorpo suo fe dovesse portare in Napoli nella cappella, che isso havea fatta fare all'Archiepiscopato de Napoli

cioè lo succuorpo sotto l'altare grande'. Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 469: 'Olivieri Caraffa, cardinale e vescovo d'Ostia, il quale fu in questa cappella sotterrato l'anno 1511, e dopo condotto a Napoli nel Piscopio'. F. Ughelli, Italia sacra, ed. N. Coletus (Venice, 1717-22), Vol. VI, p. 150, records a commemorative inscription in the Minerva chapel, now lost: 'OLIVERII CARRAFÆ NEAPOLITANI ORDINIS PRAEDICATORUM PROTECTORIS, RARI EXEMPLI DEPOSITUM, QUI VIXIT ANN. LXXX MENS. X DIES X. SACRI SENATUS ORNAMENTUM. OBIIT XIII KAL. FEBRUARII RELIGIOSE, INTREPIDEQUE MAGNO SUI DESIDERIO RELICTO'. On the strength of this record, it appears that Carafa lived a remarkable 80 years, 10 months and 10 days.

⁸³A representation of this type appears, for example, on the tomb of Carafa's father in San Domenico Maggiore, Naples. This tomb will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 7, pp. 388-90.

⁸⁴Rome, Galleria Nazionale, Palazzo Barberini, no. 1622, tempera on panel, 155 x 144 cms., with original frame and in good condition. The province of this painting is the Oratorio dei Larioni, Pian di Ripoli, near Florence. It probably functioned as an altarpiece in that oratory. See G. Marchini, Filippo Lippi (Milan, 1975), cat. no. 22, p. 204, who summarises the various opinions on the date of this painting which give a consensus for a late date of c. 1452.

⁸⁵As indicated by Baxandall, Painting and experience, pp. 49-56, the fifteenth-century spectator would be attuned to such nuances of pose in the portrayal of the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation.

⁸⁶An entry in the ricordi of Piero del Pugliese (published in Scharf, Filippino Lippi, doc. VII, p. 87), with its reference to Filippino's altar painting for the Pugliese chapel in the church of Le Campora at Marignolle, suggests that the Vision of Saint Bernard could have been executed as late as 1486. On grounds of style, this date seems correct. The date of the Madonna and Christ Child with Saints Martin and Catherine, still over the Nerli altar in Santo Spirito, Florence, is likewise a matter of debate. J. Bridgeman, 'Filippino Lippi's Nerli altarpiece - a new date', Burlington Magazine, CXXX (1988), pp. 668-671, offers a plausible date of 1494-8, based on the identities of the saints and the relevance of their feast days for events in the life of Tanai de'Nerli.

⁸⁷See, for example, the cardinals in Pintoricchio's fresco of Pope Eugenius IV's reception of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini on an embassy from the Holy Roman Emperor, in the Piccolomini library in the Duomo, Siena. For a photograph of this mural, see Anderson 21422.

⁸⁸Saint Antoninus, Summa theologica, IV, qu. 20, art. 12: 'et talis fides (viva tamen) incarnati de Vergine proprie nos importat in caelum. Unde in figuram in templo erant duo ostia, quae simul claudebantur [et] aperiebantur; [et] istae duae portae in templo Ecclesiae sunt Christus [et] B. Maria'. Cited by Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa Annunciation', p. 73, n. 67. For a discussion of the iconography of the porta clausa and its significance, see ibid., Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 144, and F. Hartt, G. Corti, C. Kennedy, The chapel of the

Cardinal of Portugal, 1434-1459, at San Miniato in Florence
(Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 123-5.

⁸³One striking local example would be the east entrance of the Palazzo Venezia, built after 1464, and known then as the Palazzo di San Marco. See Tolomei, L'architettura a Roma, pp. 63-83, esp. p. 78, illus. fig. 37.

⁸⁰Summa theologica I, qu. 24, art. 1-3., (Eng. trans., 1, pp. 399-444. See also Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa Annunciation', p. 73. Reynolds, 'Private and public emblems', pp. 279-280, gives a more complicated and somewhat farfetched interpretation of the meaning of these objects. For their possible medicinal connotations, see I. Bergström, 'Medicina, Fons, et Scrinium: a study in Van Eyckean symbolism and its influence in Italian art', Konsthistorisk Tidskrift, XXVI (1957), pp. 1-20.

⁸¹For the symbolism of the dry and green tree, see G. B. Ladner, 'Vegetation symbolism and the concept of the Renaissance', in De artibus opuscula XL: essays in honour of Erwin Panofsky ed. M. Meiss (2 vols., New York, 1961), I, pp. 303-322, esp. p. 316.

⁸²See, for example, Burchard, Liber notarum, I, pp. 125-7, for a detailed itemisation of the number and different sorts of tapers used for the funeral of Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon.

⁸³Reiterated by Aquinas in the Summa theologica, I, qu. 108, art. 5-6 (Eng. trans., Vol. V, pp. 74-84). See also ibid., II, qu. 172, art. 2 (Eng. trans., Vol. XIV, pp. 22-3) where he argues that angels act as intermediaries for divine enlightenment.

⁸⁴David Munrow, Instruments of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (Oxford, 1976), provides a source of identification for all these instruments. Beginning with the top left hand angel and working in an anti-clockwise direction, they are: a tambourine fitted with bells (ibid., pp. 33-4), a fifteenth-century slide trumpet (ibid., pp. 20-1), a Béarnais string drum with beater and three-holed pipe (ibid., pp. 13, 33-4, illus. p. 34), a pair of nakers (ibid., pp. 32-3), a trapezoid triangle (ibid., pp. 35-6), bagpipes with a Spanish chanter with its characteristic conical drones (ibid., pp. 9-11). See also Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 152. There is some evidence that Carafa was a patron of music which was particularly well supported at the Neapolitan court. See below, chapter 6, p. 344 and note 49. For an interpretation of the musical symbols and allegory deployed by Filippino on the altar wall of the Strozzi chapel, see E. Winternitz, Musical instruments and their symbolism in Western art (2nd ed., New Haven and London, 1979), pp. 166-184.

⁸⁵At least four examples were extant in fifteenth-century Rome, housed respectively in Santa Maria in Aracoeli, San Francesco Ripa in Trastevere, on the Quirinal (possibly in the collection of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere), and in one, as yet unidentified, public location (but by the sixteenth century in the della Valle collection). See Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, cat.

nos. 99-100, 102-3. The front face of the tomb bears comparison with the fragment of a mid-second-century Roman sarcophagus from the Quirinal (now in Grottaferrata) which depicts a nereid embraced by a triton with an amoretto. The male sea-centaur, left of centre, is similar, but in reverse, to the pose of a sea centaur in a drawing in the Codex Coburgensis (fol. 136) of a second-century Roman sarcophagus relief of the Triumph of Neptune, once in the della Valle collection. For the funerary symbolism of these marine creatures in Antiquity and the Renaissance, see A. Rumpf, Die Meerwesen auf den antiken Sarkophagreliefs (Berlin, 1939); J. Bialostocki, 'The sea-thiasos in Renaissance sepulchral art', in Studies in Renaissance and Baroque art presented to Anthony Blunt (London, 1967), pp. 69-74.

⁹⁶Florence, Uffizi, 183S, pen and brown ink and wash over traces of black chalk on yellow paper, 168 x 145 mm. B. Berenson, I disegni dei pittori fiorentini (3 vols., Milan, 1961), I, p. 160; II, no. 1333B, illus. pl. XVIII; M. Fossi-Todorow, Mostra di disegni di Filippino Lippi e Piero di Cosimo (Florence, 1955), cat. 19, fig. 6; Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 57, pp. 230-3, and cat. no. 58, pp. 234-5, for a copy of this drawing in Venice, Accademia.

⁹⁷Siena, Pinacoteca, pen, brown ink and wash with white heightening, 138, 251 x 436 mm. C. Brandi, 'The first version of Filippino Lippi's Assumption', Burlington Magazine, LXVII (1935), pp. 30-5; Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', p. 64; Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 59, pp. 236-7.

⁹⁸Vienna, Albertina, 58.404, metalpoint, pen and wash.

⁹⁹The Naples altarpiece will be discussed below, chapter 7, pp. 391-4.

¹⁰⁰Florence, Uffizi, 146E, pen and brown ink over traces of black chalk, 118 x 195 mm. Berenson, I disegni II, no. 1289, p. 252; illus. Scharf, Filippino Lippi, fig. 162; Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 63, pp. 252-3. For the unlikely participation of Filippino in the Sistine chapel project, see Neilson, Filippino Lippi, pp. 47-9; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 24.

¹⁰¹The dado zone of the altar wall must, therefore, have appeared as inventive in its illusionism as Pintoricchio's painted decoration for the chapels of the Bufalini family in Santa Maria Aracoeli, painted c. 1489-92, and Basso della Rovere, in Santa Maria del Popolo, completed c. 1489-92. For a discussion of these illusionistic programmes, see S. Sandström, Levels of unreality: studies in structure and construction in Italian mural painting during the Renaissance (Uppsala, 1963), pp. 41-7, 160-5.

¹⁰²Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 155.

¹⁰³Commissioned by the della Rovere family for SS Apostoli, a church under their patronage and completed by 1480. The figure of Christ survives in the Quirinal Palace and various of the apostles' heads and music-making angels in the Pinacoteca Vaticana. For a discussion of

this commission, see A. Schmarsow, Melozzo da Forlì (Berlin and Stuttgart, 1886), pp. 163-176; R. Buscaroli, Melozzo e il Melozzismo (Bologna, 1955), pp. 84-88. Since Filippino may have made a trip to Venice in 1487 (see Sale, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel, pp. 112-3), he could have studied Mantegna's Assumption in the Ovetari chapel, Padua, which also portrays the figures as if seen from below. At the time that the Carafa chapel was being painted, Mantegna was engaged on a mural scheme for the Villa Belvedere in the Vatican, which apparently also incorporated a degree of illusionism. For a reconstruction of Mantegna's lost pictorial scheme, see Sandström, 'The programme for the decoration of the Belvedere', *passim*.

¹⁰⁴Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 158; Neilson, Filippino Lippi, p. 88, identify all these figures on the basis of the inscriptions once visible on their haloes. These were, however, later additions and therefore removed during the latest restoration campaign. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 156-8, identifies the left hand group as: in the foreground, Phillip, with Andrew to the left; behind the sarcophagus 'in graduated levels of height', Peter, Simon, James; on the right, in the foreground, an unknown apostle; to the left, a kneeling unknown apostle; James the Elder shades his eyes; John 'reaches up prayerfully'; and on the extreme right, Paul.

¹⁰⁵For example, Pintoricchio's Assumption on the left hand wall of the chapel of Basso della Rovere, Santa Maria del Popolo, also includes this incidental theme, illus. in Umanesimo e primo Rinascimento in S. Maria del Popolo, ed. R. Cannata et al. (Rome, 1981), Pl. 85.

¹⁰⁶Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', p. 65: 'una città in cui non riconosciamo nessuno dei monumenti che rendono inconfondibile il profilo di Gerusalemme, pur nelle trasformazioni fiamminghe e borgognone, è probabilmente una rappresentazione dell'India lontana'. Cf. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 158, who refers to Jacopo Voragine's statement in the Legenda aurea that the Virgin rose to heaven in the countryside surrounding Jerusalem and makes the plausible suggestion that Filippino tried to give the impression of a distant and foreign place in order to convey such a location.

¹⁰⁷Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 468.

¹⁰⁸Acta Sanctorum (Martius I), ed. J. B. Carnandet (Paris, 1811), 'VII, Martii, de S. Thoma Aquinate', 'Vita S. Thomae Guillelmo de Tocco', p. 699: 'Thoma bene scriptisti de me quam recipies a me pro tuo labore mercedem? Qui respondit: Domine, non nisi te'. William of Tocco's account is reiterated by the saint's other two early biographers, Bernardo Gui and Pietro Calo. See Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis, ed. D. Prümmer and M. H. Laurent (Toulouse, 1912-28), pp. 38, 189.

¹⁰⁹Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', p. 61, is therefore incorrect in his assumption that this painting was necessarily in the Carafa chapel at the date of the execution of the Roman mural. P. de Stefano, Descrizione dei luoghi sacri della città di Napoli (Naples, 1560), fol. 105^v, refers to the crucifix in 'una bella cappella' and the

reverence it had from 'le donne nostre Napolitane', which would imply that it was in the Cappellone del Crocifisso by that date. See also R. M. Valle and B. Minichini, Descrizione . . . della chiesa, del convento e de' religioni illustri di S. Domenico Maggiore di Napoli (Naples, 1854), p. 142. The style of the painted panel is thirteenth century, but the identity of its painter not known. The Carafa chapel in San Domenico Maggiore and its embellishment will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 7, pp. 387-90.

¹¹⁰Pinacoteca Vaticana, no. 234, 25 x 28.5 cm. The panel was originally part of a predella for a polyptych commissioned by the Arte della Lana of Siena for their altarpiece in the guild chapel in San Pellegrino, Siena. It appears from the documents that the altarpiece was designed to represent the theme of the Eucharist in its various aspects with Aquinas appearing as one of the two saints on the main register of the polyptych. See J. Pope Hennessy, Sassetta (London, 1939), pp. 6-19, esp. p. 13, who dates this altarpiece to 1423-4. For a fifteenth-century panel in S. Maria Maddalena in Pian di Mugnone, which also depicts this scene, see G. Kaftal, Iconography of the saints in Tuscan painting (Florence, 1952), fig. 1105.

¹¹¹Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 180: 'l'artiste a représenté, Saint Thomas, tout jeune encore, priant à genoux devant son crucifix après avoir expulsé la femme de mauvaise vie. Deux anges, portant de grand lis, l'accostent à droite et à gauche, et adorent avec lui. Ils viennent de lui donner la ceinture symbolique, dont on aperçoit les extrémités très ornées . . . A cette idée l'artiste a joint, le souvenir de l'approbation donnée par le Christ à la doctrine du Docteur angélique dont on aperçoit le résumé ou la 'somme' déposée au pied de la croix'.

¹¹²U. Mengin, Les deux Lippis (Florence, 1904), pp. 163-5. L. Berti and U. Baldini, Filippino Lippi (Florence, 1957), no. 55, pp. 85-6. Bertelli, 'Appunti', p. 117, n.11.

¹¹³Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Wunder des heiligen Thomas von Aquin' *passim*; *ibid.*, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 73-86.

¹¹⁴See William of Tocco in Acta Sanctorum, pp. 659-60: 'juvenculam cum indignatione de camera expulit, et accedens in spiritus fervore ad angulum camerae, signum crucis in pariete cum summitate titionis impressit; et prostratus ad terram, cum lacrymis a Deo petivit orando perpetual virginatis angulum, quod servare sibi in pugna concesserat incorruptum'. See also the accounts of this incident given by Pietro Calo and Bernardo Gui in Fontes, pp. 22-4, 173-5. The language used to describe this woman provides an instance of the misogyny of the medieval churchman: 'puellam pulcherrimam, cultu meretricio per ornatum, quae ipsum aspectu, tactu, ludis, et quibus posset, aliis modis, alliceret ad peccandum' [William of Tocco]; 'ad hoc puellam meretricem comptam ornatu impudico sancto iuveni ingesserunt, que eum modis omnibus molestabat, aspectibus, verbis et tactibus impudicis' [Pietro Calo]; 'puella pulcherrima, impudica, quasi serpens humana facie, ut juvenam illaqueet, si possit, dejiciat a propositio castitatis' [Bernardo Gui].

¹¹⁵Berlin, Gemäldegalerie Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, no. 1094. Attributed to Bernardo Daddi and dated c. 1338, see Katalog der ausgestellten Gemälde des 13-18 Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1975), cat. no. 1094. Other representations of this relatively rare scene are: a fourteenth-century Venetian panel which, with its depiction of the saint standing and framed by the two angels, is very iconic (see Kaftal, Iconography of the saints in the painting of North East Italy (Florence, 1978), fig. 1263); a fifteenth-century south Italian panel and an early sixteenth-century Ligurian predella in San Domenico, Taggia. In both of these paintings the scene has been depicted as a narrative with the courtesan located in the background (see *ibid.*, Iconography of the saints in Central and South Italian painting (Florence, 1965), fig. 1268; Iconography of the saints in the painting of North West Italy (Florence, 1985), fig. 906).

¹¹⁶William of Tocco, Fontes, p. 78.

¹¹⁷Bernard Gui, *ibid.*, pp. 187-8. This account of the vision of Albert of Brescia is also to be found in the first canonisation inquiry, *ibid.*, pp. 297-99.

¹¹⁸Brevarium secundum usum ordinis Praedicatorum (Venice, 25 Dec., 1492), ed. Thomas Donatus, printed Johannes Emericus, fol. cxviii^v. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 24203). A brief reference to the miracle of the crucifix occurs later in the text, *ibid.*, fol. cxvii^r: 'elevatus a terra cernit: crucifixus ei colloquit'. The Brevarium Romanum (Venice, 4 Dec., 1497), ed. Petrus Arrivabenus, printed Georgius Arrivabenus (British Library copy IA 22569), has no office for the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas, which, in the late fifteenth century, appears to have been peculiar to Dominican usage.

¹¹⁹See above, p. 184.

¹²⁰See above, chapter 2, p. 75.

¹²¹Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 77-8.

¹²²Brevarium Praedicatorum, fol. cxvii^v.

¹²³See, for example, De Viana, Oratio in festo divi Thomae de aquino, fols. 3^r, 5^r; Inghirami, Panegyricus, fols. 3^r, 6^v, 7^r, 11^v. For Pucci, 'Oratio', fol. 5^v, the saint 'fugit exilis voluptates', cf. fol. 14^{r/v}, where the speech made by Christ from the crucifix is cited as a sign of recognition of Aquinas' God-given knowledge, his 'divina scientia'.

¹²⁴Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 78-81.

¹²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 81.

¹²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 76. The iconography of the courtesan in Renaissance art is a subject that deserves further exploration. For discussion of the treatment of the Venetian courtesan in the oeuvre of Sebastiano del Piombo, see M. Hirst, Sebastiano del Piombo (Oxford, 1981), pp. 93-4;

and by Titian, see C. Hope, Titian (London, 1980), pp. 61-2, 81-2. G. Masson, Courtesans of the Italian Renaissance (London, 1975), passim, provides some interesting insights into the social standing and intellect of these women in Renaissance Italy.

¹²⁷Geiger, ibid., pp. 82-4; for Sodoma's fresco, see E. Carli, Le storie di San Benedetto a Monteoliveto Maggiore (Siena, 1980), Pl. XIX.

¹²⁸See above, note 114.

¹²⁹Cortesi De cardinalitu, Liber. II, cap. XI, 'De erogatione pecuniarum', fols. 107^r-108^v, for example, names amongst those persons to whom the cardinal should award charity, captive Turks, widows and young women wishing to take holy orders. These three types of beneficiary rather neatly correspond to the figures represented in Filippino's mural. In the same chapter, fol. 108^r, Cortese makes specific reference to the ceremony of the award of dowries at the Minerva.

¹³⁰The townscape in the vignette behind the figures is too generalised to propose a secure identification for it. The campanile of a church is its dominant feature and could be taken as an allusion to the Church in whose service Aquinas was destined to remain. The decayed building of a secular type to the left contributes to an iconography of this sort. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 84, sees the background detail of a gateway to an enclosed garden or cloister as a symbol of purity and the ruin as an allusion to 'pagan-spirited Rainaldo'.

¹³¹The antiphon for the first vespers in the office for the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas calls Aquinas a doctor and virgin, see Breviarium Praedicatorum, fol. cxvii^r: 'Felix thomas doctor ecclesie lumen mundi splendor italie: candens virgo flore mundicie'.

¹³²O'Malley, 'The feast of Thomas Aquinas', p. 7; Stinger, Renaissance in Rome, pp. 143-4; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 32-3.

¹³³Lehman collection, Metropolitan Museum, New York, tempera on panel, 59 x 42.8 cms., dated c. 1300, see R. A. Offner, A critical and historical corpus of Florentine painting (New York, 1930), Section III, Vol. II, Part I, p. 46, illus. pl. XIX.

¹³⁴J. Gardner, 'Andrea di Bonaiuto and the chapterhouse frescoes in Santa Maria Novella', Art History, II (1979), p. 121; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 99.

¹³⁵For a discussion of the style and dating of this panel, see M. Meiss, 'The problem of Francesco Traini', Art Bulletin, XV (1933), pp. 97-173, esp. pp. 106-116; G. Coor, 'Two unknown paintings by the master of the Glorification of Saint Thomas', Pantheon, XIX (1961), pp. 126-35; M. Mallory, 'Thoughts concerning the "Master of the Glorification of Saint Thomas"', Art Bulletin, LVII (1975), pp. 9-20. For the suggestion that it might have been the Pisan friar, Bartolomeo

di San Concordio, who influenced the design of the panel in Santa Caterina, see M. Meiss, 'An illuminated Inferno and Trecento painting in Pisa', Art Bulletin, XLVII (1965), pp. 21-34, esp. p. 33.

¹³⁶This puzzling form consists of five concentric circles, painted in gradations of reddish purple and enclosed in a wide black circle. For S. Romano, 'Due affreschi del Cappellone degli Spagnuoli: Problemi iconologici', Storia dell'arte, XXVIII (1976), pp. 181-213, this is a 'globo formato dalle sette sfere concentriche', and represents the 'universo intero' upon which Aquinas sits (*ibid.*, p. 187). There are, however, only five spheres (or six, if the black circle is counted) and a representation of Ptolemy's system would require eight spheres, one for each of the planets, plus one for the fixed stars. The spheres are not shown with their respective heavenly bodies as in Domenico di Michelino's Dante in the Duomo, Florence. This explanation is therefore untenable.

¹³⁷I. Taurisano, 'Il capitolo di Santa Maria Novella in Firenze', Memorie Domenicane, III (1916), p. 24, publishes the 1365 letter of intent committing Andrea di Bonaiuto to work on the chapter house for two years beginning 1 January, 1366.

¹³⁸In medieval Latin the word cathedra is commonly used for the chair from which the professor or master lectures. See J. Niermeyer, Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus (Leiden, 1976), p. 158. In Renaissance art it was often used as an attribute of a doctor saint, as, for example, Saint Augustine lecturing on rhetoric in Rome in Benozzo Gozzoli's mural cycle in the choir of Sant'Agostino, San Gimignano, illus. in A. Padoa Rizzo, Benozzo Gozzoli, pittore fiorentino (Florence, 1972), fig. 128.

¹³⁹Following Vasari-Milanesi, I, p. 582, these figures are usually identified as Arius, Sabellius and Averroes. This identification is supported by the inscriptions for Averroes on the Santa Caterina panel and for Arius and Sabellius in the Carafa mural. It is possible, however, that Vasari's identification for the figures in the chapter house mural is based on no more than his familiarity with these two other paintings.

¹⁴⁰See Gardner, 'The chapterhouse frescoes', p. 122.

¹⁴¹For this mural, see L. Crema and S. Malaton, 'La Cappella di San Tommaso d'Aquino in Sant'Eustorgio di Milano', Bollettino d'arte, XLIV (1959), pp. 114-121, esp. p. 120, illus. fig. 11, figs. 9, 10, 12, for details. In these authors' view the two angels in the painting, 'sorreggono le corone della Sapienza e della Verginità'.

¹⁴²Paris, Musée du Louvre, tempera on panel, 102 x 227 cms. For a discussion of the dating and style of the painting, see Padoa Rizzo, Benozzo Gozzoli, pp. 83-4, 143-4.

¹⁴³Bertelli, 'Il restauro', p. 160: 'dalla pulitura risultò poi chiaramente come Filippino avesse raffigurato San Tommaso su in trono di nubi'.

¹⁴⁴British Museum, 1860-6-16-75, pen, brown ink and wash, white heightening, 291 x 239 mm.

¹⁴⁵G. Frizzoni, 'Disegni di antichi maestri', L'arte, VIII (1905), pp. 241-53, esp. pp. 243-4, and F. Ames-Lewis, Drawing in early Renaissance Italy (New Haven and London, 1981), p. 47, see this drawing as a presentation drawing. While Carafa may well have requested a drawing of this mural from Filippino, there is no conclusive evidence that this drawing was made for this particular purpose. For further discussion of this drawing, see Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 60, pp. 238-45; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 106-8. Sandström, Levels of unreality, p. 78, makes a valid comparison between the inventive illusionism of this drawing and that of the Bufalini pictorial scheme in Santa Maria Aracoeli.

¹⁴⁶Florence, Uffizi, 128E verso, metalpoint with white heightening over traces of black chalk on blue green prepared paper, 262 x 123 mm. (on the recto of this drawing is a study of the kneeling king from the Adoration of the Magi). For further discussion of this figure study, see Shoemaker, ibid., cat. no. 61, pp. 246-9.

¹⁴⁷In the 1480s these devices were clearly visible on the funerary monument of Marcus Antonius Lupus, situated on the road to Ostia, near the Ponte dell'Arca, a route frequently traversed by Carafa on his way to Naples. This monument was drawn by a number of Renaissance artists. See P. Halm, 'Das unvollendete Fresko des Filippino Lippi in Poggio a Cajano', Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz, III, 7 (1931), pp. 393-427, esp. p. 409 and fig. 8.

¹⁴⁸E. Hall and H. Uhr, 'Aureola super Auream: crowns and related symbols of special distinction in late Gothic and Renaissance iconography', Art Bulletin, LXVII (1985), pp. 567-603, esp. pp. 589-595.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 594.

¹⁵⁰Thomas Aquinas, Saint, Summa philosophica. seu de veritate catholicae fidei contra gentiles (Paris, 1925), p. 2: 'Ejusdem autem est unum contrariorum prosequi, et aliud refutare; sicut medicina sanitatem operatur, aegritudinem vero excludit, unde, sicut sapientis est veritatem praecipue de primo principio meditari et de aliis disserere, ita ejus est falsitatem contrarium impugnare . . . quod tangit quum dicit: Veritatem meditabitur guttur meum; errorem contra veritatem impugnare, quod tangit quum dicit: Ut labia mea detestabuntur impium, per quod falsitas contra divinam veritatem designatur, quae religioni contraria est, quae pietas nominatur, unde etiam falsitas contraria ei impietatis sibi nomen assumit'.

¹⁵¹For example, his early biographer, Bernard Gui, Fontes, p. 166, relates that the subtlety of Thomas' intellect came from the spirit of wisdom which dwelt in him through grace: 'subtilitate vero intellectus et ingeni sanctus doctus prepollebat, quam ei spiritus sapientie dei subtilis dederat, cum quo per gratiam habitabat'.

¹⁵²As Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 91, points out it is of interest that Dialectic rather than Rhetoric has been represented here. This choice was probably intended as an allusion to the traditional university curriculum, favoured by the Dominicans, as opposed to the newer studia humanitatis.

¹⁵³Aquinas, Summa theologiae, I, qu. 12, art. 13 (Eng. trans. Vol. I, pp. 146-8). See also the preface to Book IV of the Summa contra gentiles, trans. English Dominican Fathers (London, 1929), Vol. IV, p. 3.

¹⁵⁴Bertelli, 'Il restauro', p. 159: 'nell'angolo superiore sinistro, verso cui alza il braccio una delle personificazione che siedono a lato del Santo Dottore, si ritrovarono le tracce di un raggio d'oro uscita da una nuvola'.

¹⁵⁵For further details of these various heresiarchs and the doctrines they advocated, see Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, eds. A. Vacant, E. Mangenot and E. Amann (16 vols., Paris, 1923-1972), s.v. 'Arianisme', 'Photin de Sirmium'; New Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. 'Apollinarianism', 'Arianism', 'Manichaeism', 'Photius'. For a good survey and introduction to patristic theology and the heresies it sought to combat, see M. Giles, The Christian Fathers (London, 1966), passim.

¹⁵⁶Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph', p. 225; ibid., Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel p. 94.

¹⁵⁷See above, pp. 212, 222-3.

¹⁵⁸Aquinas, Summa contra gentiles, 'De sancta Trinitate', Bk. IV, chs. 2-26, 'De incarnatione Dei', chs. 27-55 (Eng. trans., IV, pp. 6-116, 116-218). The remaining chapters (56-78) in the treatise on the Incarnation deal specifically with the Sacraments.

¹⁵⁹See O'Malley, 'Preaching for the popes', p. 419: 'Any very protracted consideration of the mystery of the God-made-man naturally leads to questions concerning the unity and trinity of the Godhead'.

¹⁶⁰See above, pp. 190-1.

¹⁶¹Lactantius, The Divine Institutes, Bk. IV, ch. 8, pp. 258-9: 'In the first place we testify that he was born twice, first in the spirit, later, in the flesh. . . . This twofold nativity has occasioned great error [my emphasis] for human minds and has poured darkness around even those who retained the sacraments of the true religion'. While Lactantius' arguments would receive short shrift in modern theological debate, he does make the crucial doctrinal point that the divinity of Christ was neither interrupted nor began by his birth as man. He also coincidentally engages with the issue of the true nature of Christ, the debate on which gave rise to a number of early Christian heresies.

¹⁶²Bertelli, 'Appunti', p. 122. Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 173, suggests that this figure is a portrait of Fra Valentino

Evangelista da Camerino, the current Provincial of the Roman Province; Mengin, Les deux Lippis, p.170, a member of Carafa's family; Berti and Baldini, Filippino Lippi, p. 86, the Cardinal in the habit of the Dominican Order. Bertelli's identification is almost certainly the correct one.

¹⁶³British Museum, no. 1089, diameter 78 mm., obverse. The reverse depicts the god Mercury. See G. F. Hill, A corpus of Italian medals of the Renaissance before Cellini (2 vols., London, 1930), I, cat. no. 1089, p. 279.

¹⁶⁴See above, chapter 2, p. 54.

¹⁶⁵For the identification of this figure as Cajetan, see Berthier, *ibid.*, p. 174, cf. De Maio, 'Teologia e riformatori', p. 72, n.22. Bertelli, 'Appunti', p. 123, suggests Domenico Spadaforo, another associate of Torriano. Given Carafa's close association with Ludovico da Ferrara (see above, chapter 2, p. 54, chapter 3, pp. 113-4, 129), it could as well be a portrait of this distinguished Dominican.

¹⁶⁶Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph', pp. 228-9; *ibid.*, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 100-1; cf. Berthier, *ibid.*, p. 168; Bertelli, *ibid.*, pp. 124-5. For details of Orsini's biography, see Litta, Famiglie celebri, V (1847), tav. XVII.

¹⁶⁷British Museum, no. 1183A, diameter 45 mm., obverse. See Hill, A corpus of Italian medals, I, cat. no. 1183, p. 305.

¹⁶⁸Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 179; Bertelli, 'Appunti', pp. 125-6.

¹⁶⁹See Hill, A corpus of Italian medals, I, cat. no. 998, p. 262.

¹⁷⁰Bertelli, 'Il restauro', pp. 160-1.

¹⁷¹Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 463. For a discussion of this self-portrait and its relationship to the portrait head of a young man in the Uffizi, see Neilson, Filippino Lippi, p. 56. For a more recent debate on the problematic nature of the identity of the sitter in the Uffizi portrait, see B. Cole and U. Middeldorf, 'Masaccio, Lippi or Hugford', Burlington Magazine, CXIII (1971), pp. 500-7, esp. p. 507; R. Smith, 'Filippino Lippi and Ignazio Hugford', Burlington Magazine, CXIV (1972), p. 244.

¹⁷²The statue was restored under Paul II. For the documents of the relevant payments, see Müntz, Les arts à la cour des papes, II, pp. 92-3. The location of the monument is discussed by P. Fehl, 'The placement of the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius in the Middle Ages', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXVII (1974), pp. 362-7.

¹⁷³Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 104.

¹⁷⁴*ibid.*, 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph', pp. 230-1.

¹⁷⁵The accuracy of this identification can be verified by the drawing of the port in the Codex Escorialensis fol. 56^v, see the facsimile edition, Codex Escorialensis: ein Skizzenbuch aus des Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios, ed. H. Egger et. al. (2 vols., Vienna, 1913).

¹⁷⁶See above, chapter 2, p. 28.

¹⁷⁷For example, the Arches of Titus, Trajan, Septimus Severus and Constantine all carry sculpted figures of Victories. For a number of fifteenth-century representations of these triumphal arches, see Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, cat. nos. 178-9, 181-2, pp. 211-16.

¹⁷⁸Geiger, 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph', p. 233; *ibid.*, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 108-110.

¹⁷⁹Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 468.

¹⁸⁰Giotto's Virtues and Vices in the Cappella Scrovegni, Padua, are perhaps the best known example. For representations of the Virtues and Vices in medieval art in general, see A. Katzenellenbogen, Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval art (London, 1939), *passim*.

¹⁸¹Aquinas. Summa theologiae, II:I, qu. 55-70, lists the Virtues, qu. 71-89, lists the Vices (Eng. trans. Vol. VII, pp. 63-492).

¹⁸²For example, the tomb of Carafa's father, Francesco, in San Domenico Maggiore, Naples, had sculpted reliefs of Prudence and Fortitude. For further discussion of this tomb monument, see below, chapter 7, pp. 388-90.

¹⁸³Florence, Uffizi, orn. 617^{r/v}, pen, brown ink and wash over traces of black chalk, on coarse white paper, 118 x 218 mm. For further discussion of this drawing, see Bertelli, 'Appunti', pp. 118-9; Shoemaker, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. no. 62, pp. 250-1; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 116-7, illus. recto, pl. 65.

¹⁸⁴For a photograph of the altar wall of the Strozzi chapel, see Anderson Roma (6174).

¹⁸⁵Bertelli, 'Appunti', pp. 121-2, suggests that the ring is a reference to the emblem of the Medici family. Given the patron's close contacts with the Medici family, this proposal has a certain appeal. For Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 68-9, the ring is a symbol of eternity, the entwined branches, a reference to the Cross, the palmettes, symbols of victory, and the book, the book of prophecy. On a more prosaic level, the ring could be a reference to the authority and status of Carafa as Cardinal Bishop and the book a reminder of his personal impresa.

¹⁸⁶See below, chapter 5, pp. 309-10.

¹⁸⁷From left to right these are: a lantern with a lit candle; a brush used to sweep up the fragments of the Host after Mass; a box containing tapers and decorated with bucrania; a pair of ceremonial boots; a processional cross and crozier; a monstrance; a pair of lit candles in candlesticks and scourges framing the paten and veronica; a mitre; an incense burner; books and a wooden contraption whose function is obscure.

¹⁸⁸For photographs of these still lives, see A. Ladis, Taddeo Gaddi (Columbia and London, 1982) pl. 4a-12.

¹⁸⁹Halm, 'Das unvollendete Fresko', p. 409, considers the source to be the metopes from a frieze on the Temple of Vespasian. As indicated below, p. 239, the source is more likely to be fragments of an antique frieze preserved in the late fifteenth-century at San Lorenzo fuori le Mura.

¹⁹⁰Rome, Museo Capitolino, Stanza dei Filosofi, nos. 99, 100, 102, 104. See H. Stuart Jones, A catalogue of the ancient sculptures in the municipal collections of Rome. I: The sculpture of the Museo Capitolino (Oxford, 1912), pp. 258-263.

¹⁹¹Codex Escorialensis (ed. H. Egger), fol. 43^v. For a list of other representations of this frieze by Renaissance artists, see Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, cat. no. 193, p. 226. Other sources for ancient sacrificial ornament were a small frieze on the Arch of the Argentarii (*ibid.*, cat. no. 180, pp. 213-4); and a stucco relief, then underground, copied by Aspertini, illus. in P. Pray Bober, Drawings after the antique by Amico Aspertini: sketchbooks in the British Museum (London, 1957), fig. 31. For further discussion of this topic and table of incidence of Renaissance copies of these objects, see A. Martindale, The Triumphs of Caesar by Andrea Mantegna in the collection of her Majesty the Queen at Hampton Court (London, 1979), pp. 173-4. For their fascination as hieroglyphs for Renaissance scholars, see R. Wittkower, 'Hieroglyphics in the early Renaissance', in Allegory and migration of symbols (1977), pp. 113-128.

¹⁹²See below, chapter 6, pp. 348-51.

¹⁹³Carafa's patronage of Bramante is considered in further detail below, chapter 6, pp. 327-45.

¹⁹⁴See above, chapter 2, note 158.

¹⁹⁵For an account of the rediscovery of the Domus Aurea and its use as a source for Renaissance artists, see N. Dacos, La découverte de la Domus Aurea et la formation des grotesques à la Renaissance (London and Leiden, 1969), *passim*.

¹⁹⁶Vasari-Milanesi, III, pp. 461-2.

¹⁹⁷The Autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini, ed. and abridged by C. Hope and A. Nova from the trans. by J. Addington Symonds (Oxford, 1983), p. 21.

¹⁹⁸These are conveniently listed and catalogued by Shoemacher, 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', cat. nos. 64-74, 82, pp. 254-74, 288-91 (one comprises two drawings mounted by Vasari on a single sheet). The principal authors who discuss this body of all'antica drawings by Filippino, are: Berenson, I disegni, I, p. 166, II, nos. 1322-1326C; Scharf, Filippino Lippi, cat. nos. 316-324, illus. pls. 157-8; Fossi-Todorow, Mostra dei disegni, cat. nos. 23-4, illus, fig. 4.

¹⁹⁹The motif of a putto riding on the back of a sea monster occurs in a drawing of a fragment of an antique relief on fol. 28^v in Francisco de Hollanda's Escorial sketchbook (1538-1540), see Tormo y Monzo (ed.), Os desenhos das antigualhas. Since the fragment is identified as being in the collection of Cardinal Andrea della Valle (1463-1534) who, while still a bishop, had arranged it in a complex of houses in the Rione Sant'Eustachio, close to Carafa's city residence, Filippino may well have had access to this late fifteenth-century collection of antiques.

²⁰⁰Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 172-3, identifies the subject of this cameo relief as probably Iphigenia's recognition (while a priestess of Artemis) and rescue of her brother, Orestes. It may well be that Filippino used as a source, a classical gem depicting a dramatic scene of this sort for the painted framework of the chapel altar wall.

²⁰¹The tomb chamber is 3 m. wide and 4.37 m. long and lit by a narrow niche on the east wall. At the back of the chamber a metal staircase leads to a vault below the main chapel. Since the height of this vault is only 1.5 m., it must have been built for purposes of air circulation and not for burial. See Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 121, n.19.

²⁰²For an illustration of the Volta degli stucchi, see Dacos, La découverte de la Domus Aurea, fig. II.

²⁰³Titus Livius, Ab urbe condita, Bk. III, xlv-xlviii, trans. B. Forster et. al. (13 vols., London and New York, 1919 ff.) Vol. II, pp. 143-161.

²⁰⁴Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 235.

²⁰⁵Bertelli, 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', p. 63, on the basis of the similarities between these paintings and those of the ceiling decoration in the Sala dei Misteri of the Appartamento Borgia in the Vatican, proposes that the master-in-charge of that project, Pier Matteo d'Amelia, may have also assisted Raffaellino. Carpaneto, 'Raffaellino del Garbo', IX, 4, p. 7, while endorsing Vasari's attribution, also argues that Vasari's assessment of the Raffaellino's early style has unduly influenced the painter's subsequent critica fortuna.

²⁰⁶The dispatch of the bull, by an axe, with the animal's head tied down, is portrayed on a Roman sarcophagus relief which was probably in the della Valle collection at the end of the fifteenth century. Another relief, originally in the same collection, depicts a Victory cutting the throat of a sacrificial bull. (See also above, note 199.) Yet another

example, probably once in the collection of Cardinal Domenico Grimani at the Palazzo di San Marco (Venezia), shows a veiled priest at an altar with, behind him, a procession of garlanded participants and sacrificial animals. A relief from a triumphal arch, preserved in the fifteenth century in the church of Santa Martina, shows Marcus Aurelius at an altar with a sacrificial bull in the background. See Pray-Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, nos. 171, 187, 190, 191. In the Codex Escorialensis (ed. H. Egger) fol. 28^r, is a drawing of the sacrifice of a bull. A more fanciful drawing of the rite of sacrifice by Ciriaco d'Ancona is illustrated in La Roma antica di Ciriaco d'Ancona (Rome, 1907), pl. XIII.

²⁰⁷For the symbolism of the eagle and the serpent in Roman art, see E. Strong, Roman sculpture from Augustus to Constantine (London, 1907), p. 230; ibid., Apotheosis and afterlife (London, 1915), pp. 181-7; F. Cumont, Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains (Paris, 1942), pp. 88, 97, n.2, pp. 172, 339, 392-6. For a discussion of the widespread diffusion of this motif in ancient civilisations and its survival in the Renaissance, see R. Wittkower, 'Eagle and serpent, a study in the migration of symbols', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, II (1938-9), pp. 293-325.

²⁰⁸The image of an eagle with its prey in its claws appears on the Antonine sarcophagus in San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, illustrated in Wittkower, ibid., pl. 50(g). The angle of the bird's head and the shape of the wings on the sarcophagus are very similar to those of the tomb chamber mural and thus provide another instance of the decorative embellishment of this sarcophagus being used by Carafa's artists (see above, note 42). In the tomb chamber vault, the struggle between the bird of prey and its adversary has been made the more dynamic by the portrayal of the snake with its head in the eagle's beak and its body entwined around the bird.

²⁰⁹See below, chapter 5, p. 309.

²¹⁰I trionfi di Francesco Petrarca (Florence, 1499, facsimile ed., Rome, 1891), 'Triumpho della Pudicitia', ll. 136-9; 'Triumpho della Fama', ll. 78-80

²¹¹For an exploration of this topic, see F. Saxl, 'Pagan sacrifices in the Italian Renaissance', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, II (1938-9), pp. 346-367.

²¹²Bertelli, 'Appunti', p. 129; Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 128-9.

²¹³'OLIVERIUM CARAPHAM EX SUA PIA ERGA BAND[EM] VI[R]GINE[EM] DEVOTION[EM] DE PROPRIIS BONIS SUIS OPERE QUIDE[EM] SUMPTUOSO FU[N]DATA AC SUFFICIENTER DOTATA ORNAM[EN]T[IS]Q[UE] ECCL[ES]IASTIC[IS] PLURIMU[M] DECORATA'. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, 'Appendix', docs. 8, 14, 16, publishes a number of references to the chapel's endowment made in Quadri's index of the Minerva archive and in the record of an apostolic visitation made to the Minerva on 31 August, 1662. From these one learns that on 11 March, 1503, the friars at the Minerva noted the

obligations of the Cardinal and his family to finance the chapel (*ibid.*, doc. 8). On the same day, Carafa gave 13 houses in the Strada della Guglia di S Mautto (*ibid.*, doc. 16), a road in the close vicinity of the Pantheon to the Minerva in order to finance two daily masses. Anniversary masses in memory of Carafa were still being celebrated on 23 January (presumably the original burial date) in the late seventeenth century (*ibid.*, doc. 14), sometimes accompanied by a candle and money being given to the friars. Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX, cites from the 'Atto di notar Pietro de Marellis' of 2 August, 1503 (Pergamene Carafa d'Andria, no. 237) where, by agreement of the Master General [Cajetan], the friars of the Minerva undertake to celebrate an unspecified number of masses in the Carafa chapel.

²¹⁴'Testamento', fol. [2v]: 'Item relingo cappelle mee [sic] annunciate et S[an]ti Thom[ae] i[n] Minervam una[m] + argenti parva[m] et duo cal[ic]elabra argenti p[ro] altare. Item relingo dicte mee cappelle in Minerva ult[er]a tria pallia broccati iam consign[ata], unum pluviale broccati albi cu[m] planeta et dalmatica et thonicella iam datis. Item una planeta[m] broccati pagonacii. Item unam planeta[m] cum dalmatica et tunicella nigram p[ro] officio defunctor[um] faciendo. Item relingo dicte mee cappella de Minerva duos pannos de racia mangnos cu[m] istenna Adam et Eve serva[n]t in festo Anupciacionis et Nativitatis glorios[ae] virginis Marie et in festo S[an]cto Thome de Aquilino'.

²¹⁵The planeta or chasuble is the last liturgical garment in which the celebrant is vested. The dalmatic is the principal vestment of a deacon and the tunicle (a shortened version of the dalmatic) worn by the sub-deacon at mass. The pluvial or cope is another ceremonial vestment worn by the celebrant at mass and the pallium, a narrow band worn over his shoulders. For further detail on these vestments, see J. Braun, *Die Liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient, nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg, 1907).

²¹⁶Both Burchard and Paris de Grassis make reference to *panni* as part of the equipment for the papal chapel. For example on 24 Dec., 1489, Burchard, *Liber notarum*, I, p. 286, describes: 'Forerii . . . deposuerunt et amoverunt pannos virides ex capella ut chorum basilice sancti Petri pararent'. See also British Museum, Add. MS 8443, Paris de Grassis, 'Diarium', fol. 91v, where the master of ceremonies describes how on Christmas Eve, 1513, Leo X: 'iussit quod panni aurei, qui solent estendi in tribuna Basilicae ponantur in Cappella intra Cancellos',

²¹⁷A similar juxtaposition is to be seen in Mantegna's *Madonna della Vittoria*, in the Louvre, where the Virgin and Child are seen enthroned above a relief of Adam and Eve.

²¹⁸See above, note 5. Paris de Grassis, 'Cl[er]imonialu[m]', fols. 320v-322r, also describes the mass celebrated at the Minerva on the feast of the Annunciation and remarks on how on that particular day there was no visit to the chapel of the Cardinal of Naples.

²¹⁹Burchard, *Liber notarum*, I, pp. 596-7; II, pp. 75, 129-130, 207, 321.

²²⁰Paris de Grassis, 'Clalerimoniaru[m]', fol. 319^v, describes how on this occasion after mass the Cardinal of Naples, Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans, customarily invites the celebrant and the cardinals to his chapel to obtain the benefits pertaining to the papal indulgence attached to the altar of that chapel.

²²¹See above, chapter 3, pp. 143-6, 109-110.

²²²Burchard, Liber notarum, II, pp. 53, 163.

²²³See W. Hood, 'Saint Dominic's manners of praying: gestures in Fra Angelico's cell frescoes at S. Marco', Art Bulletin, LXVIII (1986), pp. 195-206, where the author argues (*ibid.*, p. 197) that the Dominicans, 'used the visual arts to diagram certain kinds of theological relationships whether mystical, moral, or dogmatic'. See also Geiger's observations on the distinctive theological and visual practices of the Dominican Observants, in Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, pp. 139-141 and passim.

CHAPTER V

The chapel of the Succorpo

The chapel known popularly as the Succorpo lies below, and corresponds to the dimensions, of the chancel of the fourteenth-century cathedral of Naples. It thus has the appearance of a miniature church with naves, aisles and side chapels (Fig. 3, A, B, Pls. 84, 85). At the 'liturgical east' end is a choir (C) which projects beyond the apse wall of the cathedral and is covered by a cupola (Pl. 86). The chapel is lit by three windows; two set in irregularly-shaped niches (D) on either side of the entrance to the choir; a third in the choir itself. The choir also provides a site for a bishop's throne (E) which is thus dignified by its separate location and decorated niche (Pl. 86). At the west end of the chapel two flights of stairs provide access to the cathedral above (F). Between these entrance stairs is a fine marble portal (G) which leads to a sacristy (Pl. 87).

The main chapel of the Succorpo is covered by a marble ceiling composed of eighteen figurative reliefs which mask a system of shallow sail vaults (Pls. 84, 88). Ten marble columns act as a means of support for this richly embellished screen. A magnificent pavement composed of interlocking pieces of marble provides a touch of colour to the scheme. It also adds a measure of organisation since its main geometrical divisions correspond to those of the ceiling above.

The chapel is lined by a series of niches (B) each designed to house an altar set in a apse and covered by a semi-dome (Pl. 89). Every available surface is faced with marble worked in fine relief (Pls. 90-95). In addition to this relief work, there are a number of other sculpted fittings. These include a large marble statue of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa (H) shown in prayer at a prie-dieu (Pl. 96); two bronze entrance gates (I) with a relief panel for their lower leaf (Pl. 97); and two wall recesses (J) framed by a pair of marble cherubs (one just visible in Plate 96). Thus the Succorpo gives the modern visitor an experience of an edifice, ambitious in scale, complex in its component parts and richly endowed with well-crafted materials. However, like many Renaissance chapels, the Succorpo has undergone a series of alterations and restorations to its fabric. This means that it no longer entirely represents the intentions of its patron and the artists in his employ. It is fortunate therefore that there survives an eye-witness account of the Succorpo written at the time of the chapel's inception.

This early written source for the Succorpo takes the form of a small vellum codex, now housed in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples.' It contains a poem of two hundred octaves, written mainly in Italian, which celebrates the life, martyrdom and miracles of Saint Januarius, the principal patron saint of Naples. More important still it supplies a detailed account of the translation of the saint's relics to Naples in 1497, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's part in this translation, and the foundation of the chapel of the Succorpo to house these relics. Although the poem was known to a number of seventeenth-century

Neapolitan writers, modern critical attention was first drawn to this poem by Miola who, in 1897, published thirty octaves of the poem which describe the Succorpo itself. In order to re-evaluate this description in the light of the changes made to the chapel in the 1964 restoration campaign, Strazzullo republished these verses in 1966 with a number of minor corrections.² These two studies establish the identity of the author as Fra Bernardino, a Sicilian, Franciscan and doctor in canon law; and the date of the composition as between 1503 and 1505. Strazzullo in particular highlights the value of Fra Bernardino's detailed description of the chapel and the author's clear reliance on eye witness accounts of the events surrounding the inception and execution of the chapel's decorative scheme.³ However, the poem also presents problems as a historical source. It clearly refers to an unfinished project and one furthermore where many of the monuments were either finished or removed at a later date. In addition it is often difficult to gain from the dialect a clear understanding of what some of these objects constituted. While both Miola and Strazzullo confined their analysis to the thirty octaves devoted to the physical appearance of the Succorpo, the hagiographic and eulogistic content of the poem as a whole has much to reveal about the complex functions envisaged for the chapel and by extension, the intentions of its patron. In my view, Fra Bernardino's poem represents not merely a piece of conventional hagiography but also acts as a polemic on behalf of the cardinal and those members of his family directly involved with the foundation of the Succorpo as a reliquary chapel for Saint Januarius.⁴ Having dealt at length with this aspect of the poem elsewhere, I intend in the present context to deal succinctly with the poem as a historical source and much

more extensively with other material on the chapel's commission and execution, paying particular attention to points of similarity and difference to Cardinal Carafa's earlier chapel foundation in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome.

Apart from Fra Bernardino's poem, a number of other contemporary sources supply pieces of pertinent information concerning the Succorpo. The local chronicler, Giuliano Passero, reports that in October 1497 work was begun on the chapel of the Succorpo in the city's cathedral and that the chapel was completed by the end of 1508.⁵ Pietro Summonte, in his famous letter to Marcantonio Michiel, also refers briefly to the Succorpo and confirms Fra Bernardino's attribution of the chapel to Tommaso of Como (subsequently identified as the Lombard sculptor, Tommaso Malvito).⁶ Several decades later in 1560, Pietro de Stefano, in his published guide to Naples, supplies a brief description of the chapel. During the seventeenth century, other guide books on Naples included similar entries which succinctly itemise the principal decorative features of the Succorpo and pay tribute to the founder, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. As will be discussed below, they also recorded later accretions to the chapel's fabric.⁷ In addition, a number of seventeenth-century biographical compilations on Naples' leading ecclesiastics contain references to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and his chapel foundation.⁸ In the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, a number of art historians also made brief allusions to the Succorpo either as part of larger surveys of Italian Renaissance art or in order to raise the question of attribution of the architectural design of the chapel and its sculpted decoration. This

question has recently been taken up in a number of articles and in Roberto Pane's two-volume publication on southern Italian Renaissance art.⁹ In this chapter it is my intention, therefore, to analyze this body of literature in the light of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's role both in inaugurating the project and controlling its final outcome. In contrast to his activities at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Carafa in the Succorpo was acting as patron in absentia. Nevertheless, the form that the chapel took and the liturgical functions for which it was designated were moulded by Carafa's view of himself as nominal Archbishop of Naples, and it is this consideration which is central to the present account of the second of Carafa's major artistic projects.

The relics of Saint Januarius

As in the case of the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the decision to found a chapel in the cathedral of Naples was affected by a number of political factors linked to Carafa's position as a high-ranking ecclesiastic and cardinal of the church. On the 26th January, 1490, Ferrante wrote to Cardinal Carafa in Rome requesting him to persuade Innocent VIII to authorize the translation of the body of Saint Januarius from Montevergine to Naples.¹⁰ It was his wish that the saint's body should be re-united with his head and blood so that the devotion of the people towards him be increased. In order fully to understand the force of Ferrante's request, some knowledge of the legend of Saint Januarius is necessary. As indicated by the brief entry in the 1498 Roman martyrology, Januarius, bishop of Beneventum, together with five companions was put to death by decapitation at Pozzuoli during the

reign of Diocletian. Other hagiographic sources give the date of his martyrdom as 19 September, 305, name six fellow martyrs, and describe the various translations of the saint's relics.¹¹ The first is believed to have occurred in the sixth century when Saint Severus, bishop of Naples, took the mortal remains of the saint to Naples and buried them in the catacombs on the outskirts of the city (the present site of San Gennaro extra moenia). In 817, Sico, Duke of Beneventum, having failed to take Naples, had his revenge by removing the body of the saint to Beneventum. The other relics of the saint - his head and blood - apparently remained in Naples and it can only be assumed that by this date they were housed in the city's cathedral. These relics were particularly valued because of their apparent miracle-working properties. The first written notification of their potential occurs in 1389, when an anonymous chronicler reports how the dried particles of the saint's blood, if placed beside the saint's skull, were liable to become liquid.¹² In the second section of his poem, Fra Bernardino refers to this miracle of liquefaction taking place on a May feast day.¹³ This appears to be the earliest documentary reference to a ceremony regularly enacted in the liturgical calendar of the Neapolitan Church. The 1337 ritual of Archbishop Giovanni Orsini prescribes that on the 19th September, the passio of Saint Januarius be commemorated, and on the first Saturday in May, his translatio be symbolically re-enacted.¹⁴ On the afternoon of that day, the head of the saint was accordingly taken from the cathedral with the archbishop and clergy in attendance. The practice of bringing the blood as well, in order to effect the liquefaction, only appears in the archiepiscopal records after 1525.¹⁵ The occurrence of the miracle on other occasions is

however well-documented. For example, on the 6th October, 1496, a special procession of these relics was held in Naples on behalf of the king who was mortally ill. According to one witness, the combined presence of the head and blood enabled the latter to melt 'as if it were water'.¹⁶

The third translation was believed to have taken place during the reign of Frederick Barbarossa when the body was sent to the abbey of Montevergine for safe-keeping.¹⁷ Here the monks accepted the custody of the relics gladly and placed them beneath a marble slab below the high altar of the abbey church. They remained forgotten for several centuries until the appointment of Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon, son of Ferrante, as commendatory abbot. During his reign, restoration work on the high altar resulted in the rediscovery of the relics of Saint Januarius and a number of other saints. The abbey records give the date of this rediscovery as the 27th July, 1480.¹⁸ As described in chapter two, Carafa received the title of commendatory abbot of Montevergine on the death of the young cardinal in October 1485.¹⁹ It was therefore both as abbot of Montevergine and Cardinal Protector of Naples that Carafa was approached by Ferrante in January 1490. As Strazzullo has demonstrated, Ferrante was also in need of Carafa's help as mediator.²⁰ At that particular time, Innocent VIII had had to endure several acts of provocation made against him by Ferrante. Matters had come to a head on the 11th September, 1489, when the pope had declared Ferrante deposed. Carafa apparently judged it not expedient to press the matter of the translation at that particular time. Relations between Alexander VI and the king of Naples were strained and further complicated by the

occupation of Rome and the invasion of the kingdom of Naples by the French king, Charles VIII. Carafa's support of Alexander VI during these troubled years clearly earned him the favour of the pope. The restoration of the throne of Naples to the House of Aragon resulted in greater political stability for the kingdom. This combination of circumstances allowed for the translation finally to take place in 1497.

The account given by Fra Bernardino of the fourth translation follows the classic topos for such events. Cardinal Carafa, having sought and received permission for the translation from Alexander VI, sent the papal brief to his brother, Alessandro, Archbishop of Naples. The Archbishop, accompanied by his brother Ettore and other members of the nobility and clergy, failed in his initial attempt to remove the relics from the abbey of Montevergine. The monks were reluctant to give up the body of the saint and fortified the monastery against entry. The Archbishop was equally determined to obtain these relics and sent for two hundred infantrymen to besiege the monastery. The prior, who had been absent, returned to the abbey and persuaded the monks to relinquish their precious possession. The monastic community swore on the Host that the relics were genuine and the bones were measured to ensure their authenticity. The Archbishop then returned to Naples in triumph carrying the body of Saint Januarius with him. Since the city was infested with plague, the relics were not given a dignified reception. However, once they had been installed in the cathedral, the citizens went there the following day to give thanks and the effects of the plague began to cease.²¹ Other contemporary sources confirm that Cardinal Oliviero Carafa obtained permission from Alexander VI for the

translation of the relics of Saint Januarius and that Archbishop Alessandro Carafa brought the body of the saint to the cathedral and reunited it with the head and blood. The consensus of opinion gives the date of arrival in the city as the 13th January, 1497.²²

As indicated in chapter two, once Carafa had acquired the title of Archbishop of Naples, he kept it within his family's control, ensuring that throughout his lifetime either he or a near relative enjoyed this prestigious appointment.²³ The acquisition of the body of Saint Januarius is one of the most powerful instances of his acting in this capacity. The possession of this particular relic was clearly of the utmost importance to Naples since it added to the power of the two other valued relics already there. It also increased Naples' spiritual renown in Italy, with the attendant economic benefits of pilgrims and votive offerings. Above all, its final attainment resounded entirely on the prestige of the Cardinal and that of his immediate family.

The commission

The earliest reference to Cardinal Carafa's commission for a chapel in the cathedral of Naples in which to house these relics occurs in the chronicle of Giuliano Passero. His entry for Tuesday, 1st October, 1497, runs: 'Che fo martedì, se incomenzai a fabbricare lo soccuorpo dell'Archiepiscopato de Napoli quale è stato a complire per fino all'anno 1508. Che sono undici anni, et soni si spisi in detta fabrica 15 milia docati quale succuorpo l'ha fatto lo Cardinale di Napoli nominate Oliverio Carrafa'.²⁴ In his poem, Fra Bernardino cites Tommaso

Malvito as quoting the sum of 10,000 ducats for the embellishment of the chapel.²⁵ No contract has been found to confirm either Fra Bernardino's or Passero's costings. Such amounts can easily be accounted for, both in terms of the materials used and the cost of skilled craftsmanship required for the working of these materials. In order to understand why Carafa committed so large a sum of money on building a chapel, we must refer again to the vital clause in his will (1509) where he makes clear his intentions. After instructing his executors that his body be laid in the tomb chamber beside the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, he requests that it be subsequently transferred to Naples and buried in his chapel of the Succorpo, in the cathedral where the body and blood of Saint Januarius already reside.²⁶ The Succorpo was therefore planned as both a reliquary chapel and Carafa's own funerary chapel. Both functions determined the form that it took. The entire chapel is encased in marble which has been intricately carved (Pls. 84, 85, 89). It has a life-size statue of the patron in the round (Pl. 96). Bronze has been used on the entrance gates, variegated stone and marble on the pavement. Thus by virtue of its greater size and more extensive use of expensive materials, the Succorpo must have represented a greater outlay of cash than the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome. In the case of the latter, Carafa had already proved himself a generous patron.²⁷ Given his degree of wealth, he could well afford 10,000-15,000 ducats, particularly since it brought him a chapel of grand dimensions and a high degree of ornamentation - a fitting location for both his and Saint Januarius' funerary monuments.

Passero also provides two dates which mark the duration of the project and there is no apparent reason to doubt them. The absence of the patron and the scale and complexity of the project would account for the long drawn-out schedule. October, 1497, would be a plausible date for the initiation of the chapel, since the relics had arrived in January of that year. Between April, 1498, and January, 1499, Carafa was himself in Naples and therefore on hand to witness the first stages of the work.²⁸ It would seem that the chapel was ready for liturgical use by 1506.²⁹

Clearly the Succorpo, in terms of its difficult subterranean site and sheer quantity of embellishment, required the services of one individual responsible for the overall design and supervision of a large workforce of skilled craftsmen. In his poem, Fra Bernardino names the master-in-charge as Malvito from Como.³⁰ This ascription to Tommaso Malvito is confirmed in 1524 by Pietro Summonte who also refers to Malvito's many assistants (molti discepoli).³¹ Whenever Fra Bernardino mentions the architecture, he describes it as complete and he never makes a clear connection between it and Malvito. Nevertheless many subsequent writers on the Succorpo assume that he was responsible for both the architectural design of the chapel and its sculpted decoration.³² This assumption requires further analysis.

Pane has recently made a strong case for Bramante as the artist responsible for the design of the Succorpo, based on Bramante's association with Carafa during the first years of his permanent architectural practice in Rome and his documented presence in Terracina

in 1497. However, historical evidence for Bramante's proposed visit to Naples and his participation in the Succorpo project is very slight. Ultimately, Pane's hypothesis has to rely on stylistic analysis.³³ Such coincidences as there are between the plan and architectural detail of the Succorpo and Bramante's work in Lombardy appear merely to reflect a common architectural vocabulary, established in northern and central Italy by the last decades of the fifteenth century and introduced into Naples by such artists as Francesco di Giorgio.

In the light of recent work on Renaissance architectural practice, the following assignment of responsibility would seem reasonable. The ambitious nature of the Succorpo project would require an individual who was competent to execute a design either in the form of drawings or a three-dimensional model which would demonstrate the overall proportions of the chapel and the number and relationship of its various parts. Such a design would enable Carafa to see that his requirements for the chapel had been carried out. It would also allow local masons to identify the technical problems that the construction of a large chapel so close to the foundations of the cathedral would involve. Although the building of the Succorpo required excavation and consolidation work, such work would have been within the capabilities of local masons. Architects like Francesco di Giorgio must have left a pool of skilled construction workers who had participated in the Aragonese building programme.³⁴ These masons and their crews would have been responsible for the excavation work below the chancel of the cathedral, laying the foundations and the construction of the walls and vaulting. The marble required for the architectural supports and panelling would have been

supplied by stonecutters from quarries in the locality and as far afield as Carrara. A large sculpture workshop would have been assembled in order to execute the large amount of carving required for the sculpted decoration of the Succorpo. Various parts of the relief work would have been assigned to those members of the workshop according to their particular competences.

The only contractual documentation that has as yet come to light on the Succorpo is a reference made to the chapel in a contract drawn up between Francesco and Sebastiano Recco and Tommaso Malvito. Here the contracting parties agree that the sculptor should execute a chapel with similar decoration to a number of the side altars in the Succorpo.³⁵ This instruction would suggest that Malvito's workshop had been responsible for at least some of the architectural design of the Succorpo. Such work as has been done on Tommaso Malvito shows that he belonged to a family of skilled marble workers from Lombardy who had a decisive influence on fifteenth-century sculpture in Italy and further afield.³⁶ From 1485 to 1508 he was based in Naples and headed a successful sculpture workshop which monopolised the market for local sculptural commissions. The surviving monuments that have been attributed to him on documentary and stylistic grounds show him a competent marble sculptor, capable of producing large-scale monuments such as wall tombs and doorways. Apart from a reference to a model (modello) for work on the cathedral of Sorrento, there is no evidence that he had any experience as an architect.³⁷ There is however documentation that indicates that he was capable of supervising sculptural projects that were on a much smaller scale than the Succorpo

and thus involved fewer assistants.³⁸ Therefore Abbate's recent suggestion that sculptors from Rome were recruited for work on the Succorpo is entirely plausible. Given the influence of the patron and the ambitious scale of the project, it is likely that such a group would have made the journey from Rome to Naples.³⁹ Opinion is divided on who should receive credit for the carving of the statue of Carafa. It has been given either to Tommaso Malvito, his son Giovanni, or a sculptor based in Rome.⁴⁰ The suggestion that the statue was carved in Rome is an attractive one, given that Carafa was resident there and the portrait head would require a likeness of him. It is conceivable that Tommaso Malvito went to Rome in order to carve the statue. It would have then been shipped to Naples. This procedure would account for the crudely carved base which shows no sign of the polish normal for a finished piece of sculpture (Pl. 96).

If the Succorpo is the result of collaboration between a large work force of masons and sculptors (some of whom may have come from Rome) all the available evidence tends to point towards Tommaso Malvito as the artistic director of the project. His experience as the head of a successful sculpture workshop had given him sufficient expertise to draw up the designs for the Succorpo according to the patron's requirements. He could then rely on the skills of the local masons to construct the architectural shell of the chapel. His previous commissions for 'chapels' had given him the opportunity to design sculpture for an architectural setting. He had also acquired the administrative and executive skills required for the purchase of materials and the assignment of tasks to groups of specialised sculptors.

The site

Fra Bernardino begins his description of the chapel by naming it the subcorpo and thus drawing attention to its site within the cathedral (piscopia). The location of the Succorpo below the chancel was not a casual one. In his will, Carafa refers to his chapel as subcorpus and contemporary sources refer to it by the Italian derivation succorpo. The name could be understood as a metaphor for the body of the saint as below the main altar in the chapel. It could also refer to the location of the chapel below the main body of the cathedral. Seventeenth-century writers' discussion of the name allows for both possibilities.⁴¹

A subterranean church or chapel which housed the shrine of a saint was more usually designated a confessio. The origin of such buildings was of great antiquity. In the early history of the western church the graves of martyrs had become the focal points of devotion and had been marked by modest shrines. From the fourth century onwards many of these shrines had been incorporated into early Christian basilicas and since many of them had been underground, they had to be contained in crypts. The lower part of the church thus housed the saint who had 'confessed' his faith.⁴²

The arrangement of what Braun terms Kastenaltar mit confessio can be seen today in a number of early Christian churches in Rome. In San Giorgio in Velabro, for example, the high altar is set in a chancel which is raised above a crypt.⁴³ In late fifteenth-century Rome there would have been two other examples which would have had a particular

significance for Carafa. The first would have been one of the most famous sites in Rome, the Confessio in Old Saint Peter's.⁴⁴ The other example would have been the ancient basilica of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura. San Lorenzo was of special interest to Carafa since he held the title of abbot in commenda and had restored its fabric.⁴⁵ The building had a complicated history. By the fifteenth century it consisted of two distinct parts: to the west, the nave, aisles and narthex; to the east, the chancel which had belonged to another church. The nave, aisles and narthex were the result of a thirteenth-century building campaign initiated by Honorius III. During the same campaign, the floor of the east church was raised above the nave of Honorius' church and a crypt laid out to house the tomb of Saint Lawrence and Saint Stephen (Pl. 98).⁴⁶ The arrangement in the cathedral of Naples with a raised chancel and flights of steps leading down to the crypt below was thus similar in disposition to the arrangement of chancel and crypt in this ancient Roman basilica.

The tomb

According to Fra Bernardino the centrepiece of the Succorpo was to be the tomb of Saint Januarius.⁴⁷ The shrine of a saint usually took the form of a free-standing monument which would allow for the circulation of pilgrims around it. In the case of a number of fourteenth-century shrines, these monuments were imposing edifices with the tomb of the saint displayed at some height from the ground (Pl. 99). It is notable that two of the most splendid had been executed by the Dominican Order, one to honour their founder, Saint Dominic, and the other, Saint Peter

Martyr. Given Carafa's close contacts with the Dominicans he would certainly have been aware of this sculptural genre.⁴⁸ However, it would seem from Fra Bernardino's description that the shrine of Saint Januarius was planned on a more modest scale. It was to have taken the form of a tomb set below an open-sided altar table and enclosed by a protective metal grill, thus the tomb must have been planned as a sarcophagus set low on the ground. An example of such an arrangement can be seen in the fourteenth-century arca of Saint Cerbone in the cathedral of Massa Maritima (Pl. 100).⁴⁹ Fra Bernardino does in fact describe angels at the 'head' and 'foot' of the 'body' of the saint.⁵⁰ But it would seem that he is referring to reliefs on a sarcophagus and not to free-standing sculpted figures set beside an effigy. Likewise the 'harpies' to which he alludes (and which, according to his description, actually have the characteristics of sphinxes) could have functioned as the feet of the sarcophagus.

Clearly this project was never realised in its entirety. Seventeenth-century descriptions of the chapel merely refer to the relics of the saint below the main altar in the chapel.⁵¹ In its present form the reliquary tomb comprises a casket of simple design. On its back face is a relief which shows Saint Januarius in episcopal vestments and an inscription with the title of the saint and the date 1511. An open grating on the front allows sight of the relics inside. The saint's tomb is now placed in the fourth bay of the chapel (see Fig. 3 K). During the eighteenth century it had been incorporated into an elaborate altar scheme and placed in the choir (L).⁵² The 1964 restoration campaign instigated its removal back to the main chapel and the

reconstruction of a simplified version of the original scheme for the tomb of the saint.

The ceiling

Previous examples of arcae had included a rich programme of sculpted figures and narrative reliefs in honour of the entombed saints.⁵³ It would seem that in the case of the arca of Saint Januarius this type of sculpted programme was located on the ceiling of the chapel where reliefs of the Madonna and Christ Child and seventeen other saints are to be seen (Table IV). Fra Bernardino identifies these figures and offers a brief indication of their iconographic significance. By virtue of their greater importance, he names the figures of the Madonna and Christ Child as the focal point of the chapel design (Pl. 101). The Madonna was traditionally invoked as the principal source of man's redemption and his most powerful intercessor. This is how Fra Bernardino refers to her. It is for this reason that in the modern reconstruction of the chapel's fitments, the reliquary casket has been placed below this panel. Moreover the tondo form of the relief is reminiscent of innumerable tomb designs where the Madonna and Christ Child have been framed in such a way.

Next in order of priority, Fra Bernardino names the reliefs depicting the principal founders of the Church, Saints Peter and Paul. Both are shown with their traditional attributes, Saint Paul with the sword (Pl. 102) and, to paraphrase Fra Bernardino, Saint Peter with the keys of the door within his triumphant grasp (Pl. 103).⁵⁴ Both saints had a

connection with Naples. Saint Peter was reputed to have visited Naples and baptised many of her inhabitants including Saints Asprenus and Candida. These saints were later adopted as patron saints of the city. Saint Asprenus was further celebrated as the first bishop of Naples and appears in this guise elsewhere on the ceiling. Saint Paul landed at Pozzuoli on his way from Malta to Rome.⁵⁵

In the case of the other ceiling reliefs, Fra Bernardino merely lists them as the four Evangelists, the four Doctors of the Church and the seven patron saints of Naples. The Evangelists and the Doctors all are represented with their traditional attributes (Pls. 88, 104).

The Evangelists and Doctors of the Church frequently appear on the ceiling decoration of Renaissance chapels. However, in the Succorpo the sculpted programme was more ambitious and effective in religious terms since it is also included the seven major patron saints of Naples. Saint Januarius, as the most important of these, is on an axis with the figure of the Madonna and Christ Child (Pl. 105). Around him are reliefs of six other early bishops of Naples, Saints Asprenus (Pl. 106), Agrippinus, Eusebius, Severus, Agnellus and Athanasius. It is significant that of all the patron saints that could have been chosen, these bishops of Naples were in fact selected. They represent the predecessors of Oliviero and Alessandro Carafa as primates of Naples. Accordingly, all the saints with the exception of Saint Agnellus are shown attired in bishop's vestments. Three of them carry books. By contrast Saint Agnellus is shown as a monk.⁵⁶ This is entirely

appropriate since he was not only a bishop but also abbot of the monastery of San Gaudioso.

It seems, therefore, that Carafa intended the chapel not only to honour Saint Januarius but also other patron saints of Naples. The seventeenth-century writer, Carlo de Lellis, states that it was the cardinal's intention to place under the minor altars the relics of other saints and to mark these altars by marble statues of these saints.⁵⁷ This part of the scheme was never carried out due to Carafa's death. Wooden statues covered in gesso were set up there instead. In the proprium of masses commissioned by Archbishop Alessandro Carafa to celebrate the translation of Saint Januarius, masses are set out for the seven major patron saints, four of Januarius companion martyrs and six other patron saints of Naples.⁵⁸ If the Succorpo had indeed been designed to contain so many valuable relics, this chapel would have had immense religious significance attached to it.

The patron's statue

In his will, Carafa designated the Succorpo as his funerary chapel. It does not, however, contain his tomb. Instead the patron has been commemorated in a more novel and dynamic way. Carafa is not shown, as he might have been, in effigy and dressed in the liturgical vestments in which a cardinal would have been arrayed for his funeral exequies. Instead he is shown as alive and in the act of prayer (Pl. 96). He appears in his cardinal's robes with the capacious hood thrown back to reveal its luxurious fur-lining (Pl. 107). The carving of the folds

that spill on the floor behind the figure suggest that a quantity of expensive material belongs to his garments. Rings ornament six of his fingers. The effect given is of an individual of high social and institutional status.

Fra Bernardino gives a fairly explicit account of the pose and facial expression of the statue of Cardinal Carafa. It is clear, however, that he is merely describing the plans for the sculpted figure of the cardinal. It appears from the poem that only the prie-dieu had been completed and that it had been placed between the entrance stairs. On it would be placed the kneeling figure of the cardinal with his face turned towards the tomb of the saint.⁵⁹ On the strength of this description the statue has recently been set up in the first central bay of the chapel (Fig. 3 H, Pl. 96). However, this new position fails to take account of the orientation of the ceiling reliefs which require that they be read from the choir towards the entrance (Pl. 85). Moreover, the seventeenth-century descriptions of the Succorpo place the statue of the cardinal behind the altar and, in several cases, as in the back part (parte posteriore)⁶⁰ It would seem, therefore, that the older position of the cardinal's statue in front of the bishop's throne in the choir was the correct one (Fig. 3 M, Pl. 108).

It was standard practice to include on a tomb the portrait of the patron on his knees, but only as one part of the overall design of the monument. For example, on the tomb monument of Francesco Carafa, the deceased is shown on his knees before the Madonna and Christ Child in the lunette above his sculpted effigy (Pl. 149). Carafa was clearly

interested in the commemorative possibilities of this type of representation. He had already had himself portrayed in this guise on the fresco altarpiece of his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Pl. 17). Carafa also commissioned Perugino to execute a large panel depicting the Assumption of the Virgin for the high altar of the cathedral in Naples (Pl. 153).⁶¹ Here he is shown on his knees before the vision of the Virgin's assumption into heaven. Saint Januarius appears behind him in the role of saintly intercessor.

In the Succorpo, however, Carafa is shown as entirely independent of any mediation by a patron saint. This type of portraiture had occasionally occurred on a royal or papal tomb. For example, the tomb of Robert II in the church of Santa Chiara, Naples, shows the Angevin ruler of Naples enthroned above his effigy (Pl. 109). Likewise on the tomb of Innocent VIII, the seated figure of the Pope had also been set below his effigy.⁶² Carafa, however, is shown in a position of respect and prayer and, from the angle of his head, he appears to be concentrating on the saintly company set on the ceiling above (Pls. 96, 107). Figures at prayer rarely appear on Italian funerary monuments. They do, however, occur much more frequently in Spain. For example, the late fifteenth-century wall tomb in the Cartuja de Miraflores in Burgos shows the Infante Alfonso at prayer on a prie-dieu. There are also examples of such figures on contemporary wall tombs in Catania and Messina.⁶³ This group of tombs would suggest that the Carafa statue belonged to a common Spanish tradition, which can be accounted for by the strong political and cultural links which then existed between Spain and southern Italy.

Original setting and decorative framework

The earlier position before the episcopal throne in the choir gave the statue a more imposing framework (Pl. 108). Fra Bernardino makes no reference to the throne and it has been suggested that it is a later addition to the chapel's fabric and belongs to the eighteenth-century restoration programme.⁵⁴ However, the design of the niche for the throne is all of a piece with the side altars (Pls. 86, 89). Given that Carafa's motives for building the chapel were affected so strongly by his position as Archbishop of Naples, the inclusion of an episcopal throne would have been entirely appropriate. It would be reminiscent of the practice of placing the bishop's cathedra in the choir of early Christian churches. One prototype of special relevance to Carafa would have been the episcopal throne in his abbey church of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura (Pl. 110).

The content of the relief panels on either side of the throne also had a bearing on Carafa's personal concerns. On the panel to the right (if one faces the throne) is a relief with a representation of Minerva with her lance and gorgon shield as its centrepiece (Pl. 111). In the literary and pictorial traditions of the Renaissance, Minerva was often used as a personification of Sapientia and this is how she appears in a number of painted allegories contemporaneous with the chapel's programme.⁵⁵ On the relief panel to the left is a female figure whose serpent identifies her as a representation of Prudentia (Pl. 112). This is how this allegorical personification is portrayed on the tomb of the patron's father, Francesco Carafa (Pl. 149).⁵⁶ The figure on the

Succorpo relief is also framed by olive branches, a pictorial reference to the patron's Christian name (Pl. 112). This motif was much favoured in the decoration of Carafa's Roman chapel and its adjacent tomb chamber (Pls. 75, 78, 80). Both of the Succorpo personifications are set in close proximity to the episcopal throne - a symbol in its own right of Cardinal Carafa's ecclesiastical status and vested interest in the chapel. It can therefore be assumed that these classicizing figures were intended to be seen as personifications of two of the Christian virtues that Carafa himself espoused. Contemporary encomiums frequently allude both to the wisdom and prudence of Cardinal Carafa.⁶⁷

One probable reason why these two particular virtues were chosen for the decorative framework of the throne is that they can easily be associated with Carafa's personal imprese. Both emblems appear carved in high relief on either side of the entrance arch to the choir (Pl. 86). The book, which appears on the same side of the choir as the relief with Minerva, can be readily related to the virtue of wisdom and its classical exponent. As has been indicated in chapter three, the stadera together with its biblical motto, hoc fac et vives, acts as a relatively straightforward symbol for equable judgement.⁶⁸ In the Succorpo, however, the stadera is consistently represented with a Janus head as its weight (Pls. 97, 101, 105).⁶⁹ Within the context of this chapel the weight could be interpreted as a pun on the name of the chapel's dedicatee, Saint Januarius. Janus himself was frequently identified with the virtue of prudence since the two faces, one looking backwards and the other forwards, suggest prudent vigilance.⁷⁰ Thus Prudentia was frequently given a double aspect, as in the terracotta

roundel on the vault of the Cardinal of Portugal's chapel (Pl. 113).⁷¹

In the Succorpo, therefore, Carafa's personal emblem of the stadera with its Janus weight can be understood to symbolize at one and the same time both justice and prudence, and it is the latter virtue that Carafa chose to have represented to the left of his episcopal throne.

The mural reliefs

This use of classicizing images to underline a Christian theme was also apparent in the original decoration of the twin entrances to the Succorpo. These were destroyed by the remodelling of the chancel of the cathedral in the eighteenth century.⁷² Access to the chapel is now by a flight of stairs that encroach much further into the crossing.

Originally these stairs would have begun at the chancel arch. According to Fra Bernardino, two flights of stairs, each flight comprising twenty steps, provided access to the chapel. At the head of each flight were to be two marble columns with an architrave (travo) between them.⁷³

Seventeenth-century accounts of the chapel make no reference to such an imposing architectural framework and, as Fra Bernardino appears to be alluding to a future scheme, it may never have been constructed.

However the seventeenth-century sources do refer to a series of sculpted reliefs in that location.

Following his description of the ceiling reliefs, Fra Bernardino makes a cryptic reference to sculptures depicting David's victory over Goliath and Judith's over Holofernes. He does not specify their location but seems to associate them with four triumphal chariots of Sol, Luna,

Mercury and Jove. David and Judith were generally taken as illustrations of Virtue's triumph over Vice, a theme already explored in the now destroyed pictorial decoration on the east wall of Carafa's Roman chapel.⁷⁴ The notion of victory is further implied by Fra Bernardino's use of the term 'triumphal' chariots. Classicizing imagery was also used in the earlier chapel to connote victory and the triumph of virtue (Pls. 77, 82). Fortunately, the seventeenth-century writer Celano offers a more elaborate description of one of the Succorpo's four triumphal chariots. According to him, the chariot of Sol accompanied by the signs of the Zodiac, Gemini among them, appeared on the gospel side of the stairs leading down to the Succorpo.⁷⁵ It seems, therefore, that the walls of the stairwells were decorated with a series of planets and the constellations in which each planet was housed.

During the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, belief in the power of the stars and planets had engendered a rich and curious iconography. The well-known fifteenth-century Florentine set of engravings of the seven planetary deities in their chariots shows Saturn, Jupiter, Sol, Venus, Mars, Mercury and Luna. Each planetary deity is accompanied by one of the signs of the zodiac. Thus in the depiction of Mercury, Gemini and Virgo also figure.⁷⁶ It would seem from Celano's description that the Succorpo series included only four of the planetary deities and that they were not placed in the usual order. The choice was possibly dictated by the need for symmetry and the view that since Saturn, Mars and Venus were of a melancholic, warlike and lascivious disposition respectively, they were inappropriate for this setting. Moreover, as the inscriptions in the engraved series indicate, certain of the planets

were deemed either hostile or well-disposed to one another. The pairing implied by Celano is that of Sol and Mercury on one side and Luna and Jupiter on the other. Each pair of these deities were traditionally well-disposed to one another. Therefore, to the visitor versed in astrological law, the entrance to the chapel would present a benign aspect.

Apart from the reference to the harpies on the saint's tomb and the four triumphal chariots, Fra Bernardino makes no comment on the wide range of motifs taken from antique sources such as sarcophagi and altars. The decorative repertoire of the Succorpo embraces marine creatures (mermaids, tritons, dolphins) fantastic hybrid creatures (half human, half vegetation) amorini, satyrs, masks, urns, birds, foliage and fruit. There are also a number of finely delineated human figures (Pls. 87, 90). Among the reiterated detail are motifs that have recognisable Christian connotations. On a panel above one of the altars and on a pilaster framing another of the altar niches appears the motif of an eagle with a serpent in its talons (Pls. 91, 92). A variation of this classicizing motif also figures as part of the painted border on the vault of the tomb chamber in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Pl. 23). As suggested previously, the association of the eagle with apotheosis in both classical and Christian culture makes its inclusion in a funerary chapel perfectly apposite. Another side panel of one of the altar niches has a relief of a pelican feeding her young, a traditional symbol for Christ's sacrifice on the Cross (Pl. 94). On yet another is a depiction of the Man of Sorrows (Pl. 85). The reworking of Christian

symbols in antique form is to be seen again in the detail of the two saints in the guise of a classical cameo (Pl. 95).

The Succorpo's decorative scheme thus displays a heterogeneous range of devices and a sporadic symbolism. The somewhat unusual absence of a pictorial programme depicting the life and miracles of Saint Januarius can be accounted for by the dual function of the chapel. Firstly, by deliberately eschewing conventional religious imagery, attention was concentrated on the corporal remains of the saint himself. Secondly, the strongly stated classicizing form of the decorative scheme gave the chapel the aura of dignity that then pertained to the classical style. Thirdly, the decorative repertoire of classical art provided a storehouse of motifs which (at least for the patron and his associates) had sacramental and funerary associations, thereby reinforcing the function of the Succorpo as both reliquary chapel and burial site.

The functions of the Succorpo

When describing the entrance stairs, Fra Bernardino also refers to two worthy sepulture. His description is such as to suggest that these took the form of epitaphs recording both the persons buried in the chapel and the papal indulgence granted to it.⁷⁷ Several of the seventeenth-century sources specify two inscriptions on marble panels set above the bronze entry gates. The content of these inscriptions sets out clearly the striking combination of private and public functions for the chapel. Over the gospel entrance the inscription read:

Oliverius Carafa, Episcopus Ostiensis, S. R. E. Cardin[alis]
Neap[olitanus], D[iv]o Ianuario Martyri Pontifiq[ue] Neap[olitano]
Patrono, Sarcophagum hoc dedicavit: Sacellumq[ue] marmoribus miro
opere construxit ornavitq[ue]; additis ei Sacerdotibus, qui quotidie
Deo sacrificent; quibus dotem perpetui proventus constituit. Ius
patronatus sacelli Gentilitium esse voluit. In primis Dei honorem,
ac laudem Sanctorum quaesivit. Favete animis, et Auctori Deo preces
fundite. Anno Sal[utis] 1506.

Over the epistle entrance:

Currite, qui cupitis Coelestis praemia vitae
Et castas huc ferte preces, haec Ianua Coeli
Pandit iter votis Deus, hic lacrymisq[ue]; precantum
Mitis adest, qui martyrio, precibusq[ue] Beati
Ianuarii, totam commisso crimine ab omni
Parthenopen nutu, ac praesenti numine purgit:
Currite vim patitur divini Regia Regni.⁷⁸

The first inscription took the customary form for the dedication of a chapel foundation. It gave the name of the patron with his titles. The chapel was dedicated to Saint Januarius and housed his tomb. It had received a proper endowment, which was a generous one, since daily mass was specified. It also indicated that the Succorpo was to be the property of the Carafa family. In 1502, permission had been granted to Carafa that he might bequeath the chapel of the Succorpo and the villa on the Quirinal to his current heirs, his brothers, Archbishop

Alessandro and Ettore Carafa.⁷⁹ The continuance of the Carafa patronal rights receive ample confirmation in a bull issued by Paul III in 1534. Here the ius patronatus for the chapel of Saint Januarius was conceded in perpetuity to specific members of the Carafa family and their descendents.⁸⁰ In the papal bull, the Carafa were given the right to appoint ten chaplains, a sacristan and two priests to care for the upkeep and the divine offices of the chapel. The chaplains were obliged in turn to celebrate two masses a week and one on Sunday. The cost of the prebend for this number of clerics and the frequency of the religious services indicate the importance attached to the chapel by the Carafa family.

The chapel had also been designated by Carafa as his funerary chapel. There is no contemporary documentary evidence that his body was transferred to the Succorpo after his death in Rome in 1511. However, an entry for the 20th January 1511 in a contemporary Neapolitan chronicle indicates that the instructions given in Carafa's will were local knowledge. Vasari, writing in 1568, was also aware of the tradition that Carafa was buried first in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Rome, and then in the cathedral in Naples.⁸¹ Several seventeenth-century writers refer to the Succorpo as Carafa's burial place. It also appears from contemporary sources that this arrangement had been carried out for Carafa's brother, Archbishop Alessandro Carafa. After his death in Rome in 1503 his body was brought to Naples in 1508. There he was given a splendid funeral with two cardinals in attendance and then buried in the Succorpo.⁸²

The Succorpo thus functioned as a funerary chapel which was privately owned and endowed by the Carafa family. It also, however, enjoyed the special privilege of housing the relics of Saint Januarius. The second inscription over the epistle entrance provides positive encouragement to the visitor to enter the chapel and receive spiritual benefits through the intercession of Saint Januarius. It implied, therefore, that the chapel was accessible to the public and a focal point for the cult of Saint Januarius.

In Carafa's will, the chapel is described as containing both the body and blood of the saint. Prior to this date the precious relic of the blood had been kept in the treasury, which was situated in a tower to the left of the entrance of the cathedral. According to one contemporary source, the blood had been preserved miraculously from damage in the earthquake of 1456 which had nevertheless ruined the Tesoro.⁸³ It seems that by 1509, due to the powerful influence of Carafa as nominal archbishop, the blood had been removed to the Succorpo. No mention of it was made in the papal bull of 1534 and in 1542 it was again located in the Tesoro. The body of the saint could be allowed to remain in what was, in effect, a private chapel; but the blood which was capable of spectacular transformation had to be removed to an area of the cathedral over which representatives of the cathedral and civic authorities had control.

The lost inscription over the epistle entrance referred to the chapel as the doorway to heaven (Ianua coeli). The wording thus plays on the similarity of the words Ianua and Ianuarius. The intercession of the

saint was one of the means by which the devotee might gain access to heaven. Below this text would have been the bronze gate decorated by the stadera with its Janus weight (Pl. 97). Janus was the ancient god of doors (jani) which could be both city gateways and doors to private dwellings.⁸⁴ In Ovid's Fasti he presides over the gates of heaven.⁸⁵ Thus Carafa's personal impresa has been elaborated upon in order to underline the message that through the good offices of the saintly janitor, Januarius, the chapel was effectively the gateway to heaven.

Fra Bernardino ends his description of the Succorpo by informing his reader that the Cardinal had also obtained from Alexander VI indulgences for those who visited the chapel on two designated days in the year. These were the first Sunday after Epiphany (which according to one seventeenth-century source marked the day of the chapel's completion)⁸⁶ and the first Sunday in May which, as has already been indicated, was the date when the saint's translatio was re-enacted through the streets of Naples.⁸⁷ While enumerating the various features of the chapel, Fra Bernardino also makes mention of the wall cavities at the foot of the entrance stairs and names their function as the storage of liturgical vessels.⁸⁸ In his will, Carafa bequeathed a large ornamental silver crucifix to his funerary chapel in Naples.⁸⁹ In addition, it is highly probable that he commissioned a handsomely decorated missal for use in the Succorpo.⁹⁰

Conclusion

In the case of his chapel foundation in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Carafa was clearly anxious to recognise his chapel's specially designated role in the ceremonial of the papal chapel and the Dominican liturgy. Such an interpretation of Carafa's wishes can be deduced both from the chapel's pictorial programme and the historical evidence for the religious events that took place within it. The above account of the appearance and functions of the Succorpo suggests that in the case of the second chapel, Carafa had other considerations in mind. In his will, Carafa gives precedence to the Succorpo, since he alludes to it as his final resting place. In material terms, this wish has been translated into a much larger and more expensive chapel. The lost inscription at the entrance door implies that the Succorpo once functioned as a public monument which, through the attendance of devotees, was designed to promote the cult of Saint Januarius. The intentions of the patron were therefore both patriotic and public spirited as befitting a native-born Archbishop of Naples. In this capacity, Carafa not only acquired the relics of the city's patron saint but saw to it that they were preserved in a particularly magnificent setting. At another level, Carafa accrued a certain amount of personal benefit in terms of spiritual welfare and worldly renown. The generous endowment would have been seen as a powerful form of insurance for the former. In terms of the latter, a full-scale portrait statue and a plethora of heraldic detail commemorated in the most emphatic terms possible his pious act of patronage. In the last analysis it was Cardinal Carafa's position as Archbishop of Naples (rather than as a

member of the Roman Curia or patron of a religious order) that had the most decisive effect on the final form of the Succorpo.

Notes to Chapter 5

¹Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples, fondo brancacciano, V, A, 12, 170 x 120 mm., 53 folios, written in humanist script, red rubrics, revisions and corrections by a later hand. It is likely to be a copy. The codex lacks folio 1 and the incipit of the dedication. Folio 3^r has a miniature of Saint Januarius in cathedra with the inscription SANTUS (sic) IANUARIUS and the incipit below. On the flyleaf are two inscriptions: 'dalla Biblioteca di S. Angelo a Nilo' and 'autore Siculo Bernardino, poema del glorioso S. Gennaro'. A page has been inserted in the back which refers to the dedication to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa on folio 2, the dating of the manuscript, and a summary of the contents with folio numbers. The contents of the codex are: Tractato ad honore divi Januarij martiris (fols. 3^r-27^r); de sanguine eius (fols. 27^v-32^r); hic loquit[ur] de Neapolitano Rmo cardinali (fols. 32^v-39^v); hic loquit[ur] de lo subcorpo (fols. 40^r-51^r); oratio (fols. 51^v-53^v).

²The verses describing the removal of the relics from Beneventum to Montevergine and their rediscovery and translation to Naples have been published by C. Tutini, Memorie della vita, miracoli e culto di S. Gennaro martire (Naples, 1633), n.ed. G. Pelella (Naples, 1856), p. 80, pp. 88-92. The verses describing the chapel have been published by A. Miola, 'Il Succorpo di San Gennaro descritto da un frate del Quattrocento, Napoli Nobilissima, VI (1897), pp. 161-166, 180-188, and with corrections by F. Strazzullo, 'La Cappella Carafa del Duomo di Napoli', ibid., n.s.3 (1966), pp. 59-71.

³At one point, a reference is made to Giacomo Carduino, Bishop of Lipari and Vicar General of Naples who took part in the events surrounding the translation of the saint's relics. At another point in the poem, Fra Bernardino names Tommaso Malvito as the artist responsible for the Succorpo and refers to him in such a way as to suggest that they had discussed the project with one another. MS cit. fols. 49^v, 46^r.

⁴D. Norman, 'The Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples: "empress of all chapels"', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XLIX (1986), pp. 323-355.

⁵Passero, Giornali, pp. 117-8: 'allo 1 di ottubro 1497. Che fo martedì, se incomenzai a fabbricare lo soccuorpo dell'Archiepiscopato de Napoli quale è stato a compiere per fino all'anno 1508. Che sono undici anni, et soni si spisi in detta fabrica circa 15 milia docati quale succuorpo l'ha fatto lo Cardinale di Napoli nominate Oliverio Carrafa'.

⁶P. Summonte, L'arte napoletana del Rinascimento . . . e la lettera di Pietro Summonte a Marcantonio Michiel, ed. F. Nicolini (Naples, 1925), p. 167: 'in lo Archipiscopato nostro, sopto lo altar maior, è una gran cappella, quale dicono 'soccorpo', tutta di marmo e sopra colonne di gran spesa. Lo artefice fo ad nostra età: maestro Tommaso lombardo da Como accompagnato con molti discepoli'.

⁷De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli pp. 7^v-9^r; C. d'Engenio, Napoli sacra (Naples, 1623), pp. 5-6; C. de Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra del C. d'Engenio (Naples, 1666-8), ed. F. Aceto (Naples, 1977), pp. 48-51; P. Sarnelli, Guida de'forestieri, curiosi di

vedere, e d'intendere le cose più notabili della regal città di Napoli, e del suo amenissimo distretto (Naples, 1688), pp. 84-5; C. Celano, Notizie del bello dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli (1692), ed. C. Chiarini (Naples, 1856), II, pp. 99-107.

^eFor example, Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 296-7; A. Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae Neapolitanae monumentis (Naples, 1645), pp. 250-1, 270-1.

^gG. Frizzoni, Arte italiana del Rinascimento: saggi critici (Milan, 1891), pp. 56-7; J. Burckhardt, Der Cicerone (6th ed., Leipzig, 1893), Vol. III, pp. 159, 179, 404; F. Burger, Francesco Laurana, eine studie zur Italienische Quattrocentoskulptor (Strassburg, 1907), p. 147; Venturi, Storia dell'arte (1908), VI, pp. 974-5, 1044; A. Muñoz, 'Studi sulla scultura napoletana del Rinascimento: Tommaso Malvito da Como e suo figlio Gian Tommaso', Bollettino d'arte, III (1909), pp. 55-73, 83-101; O. Morisani, Saggi sulla scultura napoletana del Cinquecento, (Naples), 1941, pp. 10, 12, 15; R. Causa, Contributi alla conoscenza della scultura del '400 a Napoli in sculture lignee nella Campania (Naples, 1950), p. 121; G. Borrelli, 'Un gruppo di maestri scultori nella cappella del Succorpo di San Gennaro nel Duomo', Asprenus, XI (1964), pp. 182-192; R. Pane, Il Rinascimento nell'Italia meridionale (Milan, 1975-7), II, pp. 103-114; F. Abbate, 'Le sculture del "Succorpo" di San Gennaro e i rapporti Napoli-Roma tra Quattro e Cinquecento', Bollettino d'arte (1981), pp. 89-108.

^oCaracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, p. 251, prints this letter in full.

¹Martyrologium Romanum, (Venice, 1498), printed by Johannes Emericus. The edition used is the British Library copy (IA 24233). 'Tertio decimo klallendias octobris [rubric]. In Neapoli calmpanie s[an]c[t]or[um] Ianuarij beneve[n]tane civitatis ep[iscop]i: festi et p[ro]culi diacon[um]: desiderij: euticij et acuti: q[ui] post vinculi et carceres capite cesi su[n]t in civitate puteolana sub diocetiano p[ri]ncipe'. Cf. The Roman Martyrology, ed. J. O'Connelly (London, 1962), under September 19th. For the account given in the early martyrologies together with a compilation of other hagiographic sources, see Acta Sanctorum Septembris, Tomus Sextus, new ed. J. Carnandet, (Paris, 1867), Vol. XLVI, pp. 761-892. Later hagiographies of the saint include: P. Regio, Le vite de'sette Santi Protettori di Napoli (Naples, 1579); Tutini, Memorie di S. Gennaro, passim; Caracciolo, ibid., ch. XX, pp. 189-286; N. Falcone, L'intera istoria di San Gennaro (Naples, 1713).

²Cronicon Siculum incerti authoris ab anno 340 ad annum 1396 in forma diary [sic] ex inedito Codice Ottoboniano Vaticano, curia et studio Josephi de Blasiis, in Societa Napoletana di storia patria, Monumenta storici, serie 1, Cronache (Naples, 1887).

³MS cit., fol. 28^v: 'in la sua festa qual fe fa de magio'.

⁴See Ambrasi, 'La vita religiosa', Storia di Napoli, II, pp. 547, 548; V. Paliotti, San Gennaro: storia di un culto, di un mito, dell'anima di un popolo (Milan, 1983), pp. 117-8.

¹⁵Tutini, Memorie di S. Gennaro, p. 98.

¹⁶Passero, Giornali, p. 108: 'tutti le barune, et gentil'huomini, donne, et popolane quante ne foro in Napoli, et tutto con torcie allumate, et anco ce fuo lo Archiepiscopato de Napoli lo quale portai con ditta processione lo sangue di San Gennaro con la testa di detto Santo con tutte le confratanzze de Napoli, et con tutti li clerici, et con grandissimo pianto portaro per Napoli lo sangue, lo quale fo visto squagliato comese fosse stato un'acqua'.

¹⁷Opinion varies on the date of this translation. Frederick I's dates were 1152-1190. Tutini, Memorie di S. Gennaro, pp. 78, 79-80, 81, offers two alternative dates, 1226 and 1240. Caserta and Lambertini, Storia e scienza di S. Gennaro, p. 15, propose 1154, during the reign of William I of Sicily.

¹⁸G. Mongelli (ed.), Abbazia di Montevergine. Regesto delle pergamene, V, p. 158, no. 4412 in Pubblicazione degli archivi di stato (Rome, 1958), XXXIII.

¹⁹See above, chapter 2, p. 34. On the 17 October, 1485, Giovanni Lorenzi, Il carteggio, p. 127, reported to Cardinal Marco Barbo that Carafa had been assigned the abbeys of Cava and Montevergine: 'de Cava et de Virginibus habuit d'ominus Neapolitanus'.

²⁰F. Strazzullo, 'La politica di Ferrante I nei riflessi della translazione della ossa di San Gennaro', Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana, n.s. XV (1965-6), pp. 73-90.

²¹MS cit., fols. 33^v-38^v.

²²Passero, Giornali, p. 112: 'ali 13 di Jennaro 1497. Intrò in Napoli nello Archiepiscopato lo santissimo corpo di santo Jennaro benedetto quale è uno delli patrui di Napoli lo quale lo portai lo Reverendissimo monsignore Archiepiscopo de Napoli nominato Alessandro Carafa, & lo portai da Santa Maria di Monte Vergine dove era stato gran tempo, et portailo con licenza de Papa Alesandro VI de casa Borgia, et quello di ce fo indulgenza planaria data da d. Papa, et questo di ce andai tutta la città di Napoli'. Notar Giacomo, Cronica, p. 213: 'adi XIII de iennaro XV inditione 1497. Dedomenica adoy hore de nocte lo Reverendissimo Alexandro Carrafa archiepiscopo neapolitano intro in la Cita de napolì. Et meno con lui lo Corpo del glorioso sancto Iennaro de napolì quale lo piglio dallo Monasterio de sancta Maria de monte vergene etsi ve foro prelati say et per la peste era in napolì non volse intrare dedi per non fare congregacione degente dove. Dicto Corpo se affronto con la testa et sangue de dicto sancto elquale se liquife'. The jurist, Matteo d'Afflitto, who claimed responsibility for the composition of the office for the translation, gave the date of this event as 16 January, 1496. The date of 13 January, 1497, given by the two chroniclers above is the one generally accepted by modern historians. See Matthaeus Afflictus, In utriusque Siciliae Neapolisque sanctiones et constitutiones novissima praelectio (Venice, 1580), Liber I, rubric XIII, fol. 68^v; Strazzullo, 'La politica di Ferrante', p. 84, n. 5, p. 89, n. 40.

²³See above, chapter 2, pp. 73-4.

²⁴See above, note 5.

²⁵MS cit., fol. 46^v: 'luy dicto m'ha con pura veritate/ che saglie decemilia ducate'.

²⁶See above, chapter 2, p. 67 ; chapter 4, pp. 191-2.

²⁷See above, chapter 4, pp. 177-180.

²⁸See above, chapter 2, pp. 39-40.

²⁹Tutini, Memorie di S. Gennaro, p. 128: 'or finita detta fabrica si transferi dall'altare maggiore della chiesa il corpo del Santo la prima domenica dopo l'Epifania del 1506, dove se fa gran festa; ed ottenne detto cardinale da Alessandro VI indulgenza di colpa, e pena a tutti i fedeli, che visiteranno in detto tempo la cappella, ed ogni anno le stesso giorno'.

³⁰MS cit., fol. 46^r: 'Thomase e dicto lo suo grato nomo/ da multa gente certo cognoscito,/ et de Malvito e lo suo cognomo,/ qual ha tante figure ben scolpito,/ et la citate soa si chiama Como./ In arte de scoltura stabilito,/ luy fo nutrito in quella cita sana/ subta lo gran ducato de Milana'.

³¹See above, note 6.

³²Celano, Notizie, p. 102, for example, assumes that Malvito was both architect and sculptor: 'questa si bella machina ... col disegno, modello ed assistenza di Tommaso Malvita da Como, architetto e scultore singolarissimo in quell'età'.

³³Pane, Il Rinascimento, II, pp. 102-114; A. Bruschi, Bramante architetto (Bari, 1969), pp. 787, 827, n. 10, also speculates on a visit to Naples at that time. For further discussion of Carafa's patronage of Bramante, see below, chapter 6, pp. 327-345.

³⁴For the Aragonese building programme, see G. Hersey, Alfonso II and the artistic renewal of Naples, 1485-95 (Newhaven and London, 1969). For the documentation pertaining to Francesco di Giorgio's work for the royal family in Naples, see A. Weller, Francesco di Giorgio (Chicago, 1943), pp. 10-11, 27-37, docs. XII-XXXIV, pp. 347-349, docs. XCVI, XCVII, C-CII, CIV, CVI, CVIII-CXVI, CXIX, CXXI, CXXII, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXVII, CXXVIII, pp. 378-391.

³⁵This contract is published by Muñoz, 'Studi sulla scultura', pp. 100-1.

³⁶For the career of Tommaso Malvito, see Venturi, Storia dell'arte, VI, pp. 974-5, 1044; G. Filangieri, Documenti per la storia, le arti e le industrie delle provincie napoletane (Naples, 1885), Vol. III, pp. 82-100; (1891), Vol. VI, pp. 474-6, 171-3.

³⁷Muñoz, 'Studi sulla scultura', pp. 64-6, argues that this document provides evidence of Malvito's experience as an architect. It should be noted however that it was standard practice for sculptors to execute models of buildings without necessarily having any proficiency in building construction.

³⁸For extracts from the relevant documents, see, Filangieri, Documenti, III, pp. 23-4, 83-5. Muñoz, ibid., p. 96, lists a number of sculpted monuments attributed to Tommaso Malvito in and around Naples. Pane, Il Rinascimento, II, pp. 145-163, 171-3, enlarges his oeuvre by two additional monuments and discusses a number of workshop pieces and derivations from Malvito's work.

³⁹Abbate, 'Le sculture del "Succorpo"', p. 89: 'c'è infatti forte il sospetto che ad ingrossare le fila dei collaboratori del Malvito il cardinal Oliviero Carafa, committente della cappella, abbia invitato da Roma qualche di sua fiducia'. His comparison between the figures of Saints Mark and Jerome in the Succorpo and the relief of Saint John the Evangelist in the cloister of San Giovanni Lateran is particularly convincing.

⁴⁰Muñoz, 'Studi sulla scultura', p. 89, assigns the statue to Tommaso Malvito; Morisani, Saggi sulla scultura, p. 15, and Causa, Contributi alla conoscenza della scultura, p. 121, to Giantommaso Malvito; Celano, Notizie, p. 107, refers to it as a work by Michelangelo; A. von Reumont, Di Carafa von Maddaloni, (Berlin, 1851), p. 243, proposes that the sculpture was executed in Rome; Pane, Il Rinascimento, I, p. 24; II, pp. 11, 147, 171, n.9, assigns it to a sculptor working in the circle of Andrea Bregno; Abbate, ibid., p. 101, concurs with this attribution.

⁴¹De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli, p. 7: 'nel detto Arcivescovato il Cardinal Oliviero Carrafa Napolitano sotto la Cappella Maggiore fè edificare un luogo à modo di piccola Chiesa detto da noi, Guiso in cuorpo, op'elra marevegliosa, e di gran spesa, creato tutto di marmi gentili'. D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, p. 5: 'sotto l'Altar maggiore il Cardinale Oliviero Carafa ... edificò una picciola Chiesa da noi detto l'Soccorpo (che da gli Ecclesiastici più tosto Confessione chiamar si dovrebbe)'. Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, p. 271: 'sed quod Subcorpus dicta est haec Oliveriana Cappella, in causa fuit, ipsa populi erga Ianuarium devotio. Quasi quod corporis nomine, non aliud, quam pretiosum Ianuarij corpus, fuerit intelligendum'.

⁴²F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, 'Confessio', Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie (Paris, 1914), Vol. II, col. 2503. For the history of these early buildings, see A. Grabar, Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique (Paris, 1943-6).

⁴³J. Braun, Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Munich, 1924), Vol. I, pp. 192-220, II, Pl. 162.

⁴⁴For a reconstruction of the appearance of the Confessio in Old Saint Peter's, see J.B. Ward Perkins, 'The shrine of Saint Peter and its twelve spiral columns', The Journal of Roman Studies, XLII (1953), pp. 21-4, figs. 1, 2.

⁴⁵Carafa's patronage of this basilica is dealt with below, chapter 6, pp. 348-51. It is of interest that Filippino Lippi appears to have adapted a number of details from San Lorenzo fuori le Mura for the decoration of Carafa's chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. See above, chapter 4, pp. 180, 239.

⁴⁶For the essential archeological evidence and bibliography see R. Krautheimer, Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae: San Lorenzo fuori le Mura (Città del Vaticano, 1962), Vol. II.

⁴⁷MS cit., fol. 42v: 'In mezo quel subcorpo hedificato/ serrà un sepulchro digno eccellente:/ in questo quel maistro à preparato/ con tucti li soi cinque sentimento,/ per compiacer quel sancto multo grato/ et per conforto de tucti vidente,/ per far contente quello cardinale/ et per conforto de tucti mortali'.

⁴⁸The marble shrine of Saint Dominic had been carved in the second half of the thirteenth century in the shape of a reliquary sarcophagus by Nicola Pisano and his team of assistants. An upper structure had been commissioned in 1469 from Niccolò dell'Arca. See C. Gnudi, Nicola Arnolfo, Lapo: l'arca di San Domenico in Bologna (Florence, 1948), pp. 57-105, Pls. 28-83; S. Bottari, L'arca di San Domenico in Bologna (Bologna, 1964). The arca of Saint Peter Martyr in Sant'Eustorgio, Milan, dated 1339, by Giovanni di Balduccio, and the late fourteenth-century arca of Saint Augustine in San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro, Pavia, are likewise free-standing monuments supported by caryatid figures and embellished by sculpted figures and reliefs. See J. White, Art and architecture in Italy 1250-1400 (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 310-12, Pl. 150, p. 393, Pl. 187.

⁴⁹Signed by Goro di Gregorio and dated 1324.

⁵⁰MS cit., fol. 42r, 43r: 'Quattro animal quil mastro vol scolpire/ equal informa et simili in aspetto,/ sopra li qual intende stabilire/ quel gran sepulchro de l'homo perfectio./ D'aquila tien lo capo, intesi dire,/ di donna li soi bracia, ventri et pecto:/ un piede recto tiene de lione,/ arpia se chiama da tucte persune./ Et a similitudini de christo,/ el quale stecte nel sepulcro morto,/ un angelo de luce li fo visto/ a capo, a l'altro a piede fra quel orto/ per allegare quello core tristo/ de quella Magdalena, multo smorto:/ quel mastro accorto vol representare/ tal acto in quel sepulchro qual ha fare'.

⁵¹See for example, De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli, fol. 10r; D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, p. 6; Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, p. 271.

⁵²F. Strazzullo, Saggi storici sul Duomo di Napoli (Naples, 1959), pp. 99-105.

⁵³This is also true of the series of fifteenth-century shrines that have survived as, for example, the altar tomb of Saint Regolo in the Duomo, Lucca, by Matteo Civitale; the reliquary altarpiece of Saint Savino in the Duomo, Faenza, by Benedetto da Maiano; the free-standing arca of Saint Lanfranco in San Lanfranco, Pavia, by Amadeo. See

C. Barrachini and A. Caleca (eds.) Il Duomo di Lucca (Lucca, 1973), pp. 46, 137, Pls. 560, 564, 572; L. Cendali, Giuliano e Benedetto da Maiano (San Casciano, 1926), pp. 94, 99, figs. 25-29; F. Malaguzzi Valeri, Giovanni Antonio Amadeo: scultore e architetto lombardo (Bergamo, 1904), pp. 262-266.

⁵⁴MS cit., fol. 41r: 'quil papa primo principe zelante, / apostolo de Christo sancto piero, / qual tiene in quella curte triu[m]phante / li chiave de le porte, pastor vero'.

⁵⁵This event is told briefly in the Acts of the Apostles 28: 13-14. See also Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, chapters III and IV, pp. 41-105.

⁵⁶The engravings in Regio, Le sette Santi, make the same distinction between the monastic habit of Saint Agnellus and the pontificals of the other patron saints of Naples. See F. Holweck, Dictionary of Saints (London, 1924), for the biographical details and dates of the feast days of these saints (with the exception of Saint Eusebius).

⁵⁷De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, pp. 49-50: 'aveva il Cardinale ... designato di collocare sotto degli altri Altari minori l'ossa degli altri Santi Protettore di Napoli e d'altri Santi, ma che non poté ciò eseguire prevenuto dalla morte, con ponere su di ciascuno di essi Altari le statue marmoree di quel Santo di cui sotto si conservavano le Reliquie ... oggi, però, su di essi si veggono le statue di legno, fatte come di marmo, di tutti i Protettori della Città'. See also Sarnelli, Guida de'forestieri, p. 85; Celano, Notizie pp. 105-6.

⁵⁸Naples, Archivio degli Ebdomadori del Duomo, Codice miscellaneo, fasc. XIII, Proprium missarum Sanctae Neapolitanae, [fol. 1r]: 'Reverendissimus in Christo pater dominus noster Alexander Carafa, divina providentia archiepiscopus Neapolitanus ... ordinavit supra scriptas missas infrascriptorum patronorum almae civitatis neapolis ad laudem omnipotentis dei et gloriam civitatis Neapolis'. The masses set out in this edition are for Saints Januarius, Severus, Restituta, Athanasius, Asprenus, Agnellus, Eusebius, Patricia, Candida, Sossus, Eutichius and Acutius, Gaudiosus, Gregorius Armenus, Juliana, Potitus, Proclus and pro vitanda mortalitate. Naples had been devastated by plague in 1497.

⁵⁹MS cit., fol. 45r: 'for de la grata in meczo le doe scale / uno scabello sta polito e necto: / yvi starrà quel digno cardinale / genibus flexis capite scoperto / innante al Sancto de vita immortale: / manibus iunctis con suo tucto affecto, / suo grato aspecto verso quel pastore / qual prese per suo digno defensore'.

⁶⁰De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, p. 49: 'nella parte posteriore del detto Altare vedesi la statua di esso Cardinale in atto supplichevole e orante avanti al Santo Martire, tanto al naturale, che par che spiri'. D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, Sarnelli, Guida de'forestieri, Celano, Notizie, all describe the statue of Carafa behind the main altar.

⁶¹This altarpiece will be discussed in further detail below, chapter 7, pp. 391-4.

⁶²The tomb monument of Robert of Anjou in Santa Chiara was executed between 1343 and 1345 by Giovanni and Pacio da Firenze. See, White, Art in Italy 1200-1400, pp. 289-290. The tomb monument of Ladislaus and Giovanna in San Giovanni a Carbonara, dated 1428, and executed by Andrea da Firenze also shows the two monarchs enthroned. See Pane, Il Rinascimento I, pp. 107-111, Pl. 64. The tomb monument of Innocent VIII, completed by 1498, has been rearranged and now shows the seated pope above the effigy. An early seventeenth-century drawing shows the original arrangement with seated pope below the effigy. See J. Pope-Hennessy, Italian Renaissance sculpture (2nd ed., London and New York, 1971), pp. 301-2, figs. 70, 71.

⁶³For the richly decorated Spanish wall monuments designed by Gil de Siloe, see T. Müller, Sculpture in the Netherlands, Germany, France and Spain, 1400 to 1500 (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 152-3, Pls. 157A-B. For the monuments of Ferdinando de Acuña (d. 1494) in the Duomo, Catania, and Angelo Balsamo (d. 1507) reconstructed in the Museo Nazionale, Messina, see E. Mauceri, 'Antonello Freri scultore messinese del Rinascimento', Bollettino d'arte (1925-6), pp. 385-398, figs. 2-5, 6-11.

⁶⁴Strazzullo, 'La Cappella Carafa', pp. 97-8.

⁶⁵For example, Botticelli's Pallas and the Centaur (Uffizi), Mantegna's Triumph of Wisdom over Vice (Louvre), and the statue of Minerva in the background of Raphael's School of Athens (Stanza della Segnatura, Vatican).

⁶⁶This monument and Carafa's part in its execution will be discussed below, chapter 7, pp. 388-90.

⁶⁷See above, chapter 2, p. 75.

⁶⁸See above, chapter 3, pp. 125-6.

⁶⁹This Janus weight also appears on the stadera which decorates the altarpiece frame (Pl. 17) in the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, but not elsewhere in this chapel nor in the neighbouring tomb chamber.

⁷⁰In a poem addressed to the statue of Pasquino in the guise of Janus at the 1509 festival, the connection between Janus' twin-headed aspect and Prudence is made. See above, chapter 3, p. 134.

⁷¹Hartt, Corti and Kennedy, The chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, Pls. 18, 19. A medal of Carafa's nephew, Andrea Carafa, Count of Santa Severina, shows on its reverse Prudence, holding a double-faced head on a handle. See Hill, A corpus of Italian medals, I, p.87, no.349, II, Pl. 57.

⁷²Strazzullo, 'La Cappella Carafa', pp. 62-3; R. de Stefano, La cattedrale di Napoli. Storia, restauro, scoperte, ritrovamenti (Naples, 1975), pp. 27-8.

⁷³MS cit., fol. 44r: 'Il testa a d'ogni scala ce verranno/ doe gran colonne multo ben ornate,/ sopra le qual un travo mo ce fanno,/ de marmore finissime attilate./ la sua longecza compassata l'hanno/ cinquanta et uno palmo, sappiate:/ son mesurate tal colonne belle,/ quindice palme con soi capitelle'.

⁷⁴See above, chapter 4, pp. 235-6.

⁷⁵Celano, Notizie, pp. 99-100: 'calando poi da dett'altare, da ambi lati della già dette scale, vi si veggono due altre bellissime scale di marmo, ben lavorate, e ornate con finissimi intagli d'arabeschi e di figure picciole ne'lati, e in quello della parte dell'Evangelo, vi se vede il carro del Sole con diversi segni del Zodiaco, e fra questi il segno dei Gemini, che sono due giovani abbracciati insieme'. Caracciolo, De sacris Ecclesiae, p. 270 and De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, pp. 48-9, also refer to the reliefs depicting David, Judith and the chariots of Sol, Luna, Mercury and Jove.

⁷⁶F. Lippman (ed.), The seven planets, facsimile ed., trans. F. Simmonds (London and New York, 1895), Pls. AI-AVII, Plates AVI shows Sagittarius instead of Gemini but, as the other versions show (e.g. Pl. BVI) this was an error on the part of the draughtsman. These engravings are attributed to Baccio Baldini and generally dated c. 1460. For the iconography of the planets see J. Seznec, The survival of the pagan gods (New York, 1453), pp. 37-83.

⁷⁷MS cit., fol. 45r: 'ce veneno doe digne sepulture/ per quil che sence vole sePELLIRE;/ al qual concede quel summo pastore/ che absolvere se poza al suo volere/ nel suo morire, con tal potestate,/ da pena et colpa de tucti peccati'.

⁷⁸D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, p. 6. De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli, fols. 7v, 8r/v and De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, p. 51, record these inscriptions with minor variations. These writers attribute the composition of these dedications to the late fifteenth-century Neapolitan humanist, Pietro Gravina. For Carafa's association with Pietro Gravina, see above, chapter 3, p. 145 and note 173.

⁷⁹Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 157, n.41.

⁸⁰Cited by Strazzullo, 'La politica di Ferrante', p. 71: 'et cum in ea dictum corpus honorifice collatum extisset, varijs ornamentis ad cultum divinum necessarijs decoraverat, ac de suis proprijs bonis temporalibus pro una sacrista et decem cappellanis, ac duobus clericis qui inibi in divinis continuo deserviunt, et ad nutum patronorum ipsius cappellae pro tempore'. Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 317-9, prints the papal bull issued by Paul III in full. On 25 January, 1564, Duke Riccardo Carafa d'Andria signed an act of cession in favour of the Archbishop of Naples, Cardinal Alfonso Castaldo. See Caserta and Lambertini, Storia al'miraculo di S. Gennaro, p. 49.

⁸¹See above, chapter 4, note 82.

⁸²Passero, Giornali, p. 156, the entry for the 31st October, 1508: 'lo corpo fo misso a lo succuorpo'. Notar Giacomo, Cronica, pp. 311-2, describes in some detail the archbishop's funeral exequies.

⁸³Notar Giacomo, ibid., p. 97, the entry for the 4th December, 1456: 'et cascaro piu hedificii innapoli ... la torre dello Episcopato dove era el sangue del glorioso sancto Iennaro et miraculose foro trovati dui travi sopra le carrafelle dove non patera lesione alcuna'. See also A. di Constanzo, Historia del regno di Napoli (Aquila, 1581), XIX, p. 427: 'e cadde in Napoli l'Archivescovato'. De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli, fol. 9^r-10^r, refers to the many relics inside the Tesoro. These included the blood and head of Saint Januarius and the heads of another five of the seven major patron saints of Naples.

⁸⁴Janus was celebrated as such at the feast of Pasquino held under Carafa's auspices in 1510. See also J. Toutain's entry, 'Janus', Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, eds. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio (Paris, 1900), V, pp. 609-15.

⁸⁵Giovanni Pico della Mirandola in his commentary on the opening passage of Ovid's Fasti where Janus presides over the gates of Heaven, reserves Janus as a symbol for 'celestial souls'. See E. Wind, Pagan mysteries in the Renaissance (n. ed., London, 1967), pp. 200-1. Carafa could have been aware of such a text since he was related through marriage to Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola. See Table II and above, chapter 3, p. 128.

⁸⁶See above, note 29.

⁸⁷See above, p. 288.

⁸⁸MS cit., fol. 45^v: 'a pie' de quella scala un bel retrecto/ ... le cose sacre bene conservare'.

⁸⁹'Testamento', fol. 3^v: 'item relingo [word missing] mangnam argenti decoratum bene ornatum et ornatum cum crucifixo cappelle mee [sic] subcorporis Santi Ianuarii Neapolitane ubi erit sepultura mea'.

⁹⁰Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Marlay 10. The date 1488 forms part of the border decoration on fols. 122^v, 230^r. Carafa's coat of arms originally formed part of the border on fols. 5^r, 163^v. These have been overpainted by those of Antonio Scarampa, Bishop of Nola (1549-68). Since the first two masses in the Sanctorale are for Saint Januarius, this missal must have been intended for use in the Succorpo. I am grateful to Pamela Robinson for allowing me to see the entry in her forthcoming catalogue of medieval MSS in Cambridge.

CHAPTER VI

Other projects in Rome

In order to assess fully the nature and extent of Oliviero Carafa's patronage of art and architecture, a number of other projects commissioned by him need to be taken into consideration. These occur principally in two locations - Rome and Naples - and will be discussed in this and the following chapter. Since the historical evidence for several of these projects is too scarce to establish a definite chronology for the pattern of patronage in each city, they will be divided into ecclesiastical and secular commissions and treated in a descending order, according to the amount of surviving physical and documentary evidence.

The convent of Santa Maria della Pace

Carafa's commission of the cloister beside the Roman church of Santa Maria della Pace is well established. This is due in no small part to the inscription, incised in fine letters on the frieze of the cloister, which proclaims that Oliviero Carafa, Bishop of Ostia and Cardinal of Naples, piously dedicated this building to God, the Virgin Mary and the Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation (Pls. 114-116).¹ However, since a number of other architectural features in the adjacent conventual buildings are similarly embellished with Carafa's coat of arms, his imprese and inscriptions citing his name and title, it is clear that his patronage extended far beyond the cloister alone.² As

further evidence of his sponsorship, Carafa refers in his last will and testament to the library that he had built at Santa Maria della Pace³, a detail hitherto unnoticed in the literature on this conventual building. In 1510 Albertini gives a brief acknowledgement of Carafa's part in adding further embellishment to Sixtus IV's foundation of Santa Maria della Pace.⁴ Vasari's accounts, meanwhile, first in the 1550 edition of the Lives and secondly in an expanded version in the 1568 edition, provide the earliest published (and most informative) sources for Carafa's association with and influential patronage of Bramante and the latter's role in the construction of the cloister at Santa Maria della Pace.

According to Vasari, Bramante wished to live independently and free of obligation to work in order to take measurements of all the ancient buildings of Rome. Within a short time, he had duly measured all the buildings in the city and the Campagna, travelling as far as Naples in his quest for antiquities. When the Cardinal of Naples became aware of Bramante's inclination (animo) he began to favour the artist. While Bramante was pursuing his studies, the cardinal decided to rebuild the cloister of the Pace in travertine and gave Bramante charge of the project. Since Bramante desired to earn the gratitude of the cardinal he took every care and diligence with the work and soon brought it to completion. In Vasari's view, although the cloister was not a work of total beauty it gave Bramante a good reputation since there were not many in Rome who attended to architecture with such love, diligence and energy as Bramante.⁵

Given Vasari's influential and well-publicized attribution of the cloister to Bramante, subsequent literature has tended to pay attention to the cloister to the detriment of the conventual complex as a whole. Seventeenth and eighteenth-century guide books tend to devote much more attention to the church itself and the circumstances of its foundation than to the adjacent conventual buildings, its patron and architect.⁶ Within the extensive bibliography of the architect himself, the cloister is examined as an example of one of Bramante's earliest and therefore less resolved projects in Rome before he progressed to his more ambitious architectural schemes for the Vatican and Saint Peter's.⁷ Since it is evident that Carafa's commission involved a new convent for the Canons Regular, the following analysis will treat the cloister as an integral part of this religious foundation.

Originally on the site of Santa Maria della Pace had been a small church dedicated to Saint Andrew, within whose portico was an image of the Madonna and Christ Child which was purported to have bled when stones were thrown at it. Due to this miraculous incident the image was placed in the church and attracted great devotion. The church itself was built by Sixtus IV when in 1482 he negotiated (with Carafa's aid) a peace agreement with Naples, thus fulfilling a vow made before this image. This occasion was further commemorated by a literary tribute to Sixtus IV composed by Benedetto Maffei and dedicated to Oliviero, Cardinal Bishop of Sabina.⁸ The likely architect for the design and building of Santa Maria della Pace was Baccio Pontelli who worked on a number of architectural projects for Sixtus IV and his family. A papal bull of 1483 describes the church as complete.⁹ The inscription under the mural

in the Corsia Sistina of the hospital of Santo Spirito in Sassia, which depicts the construction of Santa Maria della Pace as one of the pope's achievements, states that the pope also built most of the adjoining convent.¹⁰ From Marconi's summary of his archaeological investigation of the building conducted in 1960, it appears that the west wing of the convent is earlier in date than the rest of the building complex.¹¹ On examination the exterior wall on the Via Arco della Pace does appear cruder in construction and the windows representative of a type used on Roman buildings of the mid-fifteenth century (Pls. 117-118). This would suggest the presence of an earlier but modest religious establishment beside the new church. Since Sixtus IV, shortly after his accession to the papal throne, had yielded to the demands of the secular canons at San Giovanni Lateran to evict the Canons Regular from that church and had given the latter permission to establish a house at Santa Maria della Pace, some kind of residential accommodation would have been needed for the newly established community.¹² As mentioned in chapter two, the Canons Regular probably acquired the support of Oliviero Carafa as a powerful Cardinal Protector in 1488.¹³

Clearly the needs of the Canons soon outgrew the first conventual building. The reasons why Carafa chose the yet-unknown Bramante to design a more spacious and imposing residence for them are intriguing. Despite Vasari's theory that Bramante wished to seek independence from the constraints of commissioned work, it is unlikely that the architect would have wished to detach himself from the orbit of a powerful sponsor, particularly since, by leaving Milan, he had removed himself from a network of social contacts, crucial for the successful practice

of Renaissance artists. Vasari himself admits that Bramante had left Milan and journeyed to Rome for the Jubilee of 1500, an event which traditionally provided artists with lucrative commissions. His principal patron in Milan, Ludovico Sforza, had been expelled from the city in September, 1499, and Bruschi, Bramante's modern biographer, thinks that shortly after this event the architect judged it expedient to remove himself to Rome.¹⁵ The earliest Roman projects attributed to Bramante by Vasari (the fountain at Santa Maria in Trastevere and San Giacomo degli Spagnuoli) were commissions from leading members of the Spanish community in Rome. Since Carafa was a long-established representative of both Spanish and Neapolitan interests in Rome, it can be assumed that Bramante owed these commissions to the Cardinal's influence. The likelihood of Bramante being furnished with an introduction to Carafa by Milanese contacts is therefore all the more compelling. Geiger's suggestion that these could have been relatives of Carafa's predecessor as Cardinal Protector of the Canons Regular, the Milanese cardinal Giovanni Arcimboldi, is unlikely given the time lapse of some twelve years between Arcimboldi's death and Bramante's journey to Rome. Her other proposal, that the Dominicans of Santa Maria delle Grazie in Milan provided Bramante with such an introduction, is far more plausible, particularly since, as she omits to note, Carafa's protégé, Vincenzo Bandello, was prior of that Milanese house and in 1501, thanks to Carafa's powerful support, was elected Master General of the Order.¹⁶

The chronology of the project is relatively easy to establish. Two notarial documents in the archive of the Canons Regular at San Pietro in Vincoli record an agreement made in August 1500 between a stonecutter

and the syndic of the convent of Santa Maria della Pace for the execution of eight composite piers for the cloister.¹⁷ The inscription on the cloister frieze gives the date 1504 and another inscription, recorded by Chacon as in the refectory but now over a doorway on the east side of the cloister, gives the date 1503 (Pl. 119). There is therefore the possibility that the actual building of the convent took place before Bramante designed the cloister. However, the proportions of the building as a whole are such as to suggest that the convent and cloister were designed as a single scheme. The project was presumably carried out between 1500 and 1504 at a time when Carafa was also involved in financing another architectural scheme in the crypt of the cathedral of Naples.

From the contractual documents that survive,¹⁸ it appears that on 17 August 1500, a Fiesolan stone-cutter, Bartolommeo d'Antonio, currently resident in the Roman parish of Sant'Eustorgio (also Carafa's city domicile) entered into an agreement with Jacopo da Cremona, canon of Santa Maria della Pace and official representative of his community. Bartolommeo undertook to cut and finish eight travertine piers (octo colone quadre de travertino). The measurements of these piers and their capitals were precisely specified. Each had to conform to a drawing (disegno) supplied by Bramante who is clearly named in the document as the master architect. The work had to take place at the convent in the month of September with Bartolommeo undertaking all the expense. For the cost and manufacture of these architectural elements, the convent promised to pay for each pier and pilaster (referred to as colona and pilastra respectively) eight ducats worth of carlini. If they were

completed to the satisfaction of Bramante, the canon agreed to give Bartolommeo three more ducats. The document was drawn up in the presence of Bramante, Domenico di Paolo, a stonecutter from Rome, and Carlo da Brescia, a builder (fabricatore). A second notarial document, written in Latin, and dated 25 August, 1500, recorded that Bartolommeo had received from Jacopo twenty ducats, at rate of ten carlini per ducat, for the work referred to in the previous document. Andrea di Maso, a Florentine stonecutter also resident in Sant'Eustorgio, agreed to act as guarantor for the work.

From these documents it is clear that Bramante acted as the architectural designer who furnished skilled stonecutters with blueprints for specific architectural components that were to be worked in stone for the cloister. He also acted as the supervisor who controlled and vetted the quality of work submitted. The presence of a builder as one of the witnesses signifies another kind of expertise needed on the project, namely the construction of the walls and the vaulting (Pl. 120). The timber roofing of the upper cloister walks and the upper rooms in the convent would have required the services of a team of woodworkers (Pl. 114).

Other details that can be gleaned from the contract receive confirmation in the physical construction of the building itself. The material specified for the piers is the local sandstone - travertine. Travertine has been used on the piers of the lower cloister arcade, the attached Ionic pilasters, their high bases, the attached pilasters and cornices of the cloister walls, the Composite piers and columns on the upper

arcade and the doors and window frames throughout the building (Pls. 114, 121). The outer face of the lower entablature has also been executed in travertine, while the inner face has been constructed in brick with a coat of plaster applied over it. The upper entablature also comprises travertine but the spaces between the corbels plastered brick (Pls. 114, 122, 123). The carving of the architectural components is generally of a high quality (Pls. 124-126). However, the crispness of certain details has become obscured by a heavy coat of straw-coloured intonaco which has been applied to the surface of the walls at a later date. This plasterwork, which modern analysis has identified as a mixture of pozzolino and chalk, has been applied in large circular strokes and in its method of application is not very different from what remains of the original plasterwork still visible on the exterior facade of the east wing on the Vicolo della Volpe which runs behind the church (Pl. 127).

From the nineteenth-century plan of the convent drawn by Letarouilly it is possible to gain an impression both of the symmetry of the building complex and of the physical limitations of its urban site (Fig. 4).²⁰ Bruschi, in his study (primarily of the cloister) proposes that Bramante designed the cloister and the adjacent buildings according to a deliberately conceived modular scheme. In his view, the architect chose to lay out his plan on the basis of the angle of the pre-existing Vicolo della Volpe. All the walls of the convent thus lie parallel or at right angles to this line. By establishing (somewhat arbitrarily) another line in the middle of what has now been established as an earlier range of buildings, Bruschi maintains that the cloister and conventual

buildings correspond to a square grid of sixteen modules. Varied combinations of these modules mark out the dimensions of the refectory (2); the central courtyard (4); the cloister and its walkways (9). By further subdividing this module into two, the position of the piers on both the upper and lower arcades of the cloister could be determined; by dividing it into four, the position of the columns in relation to the piers on the upper arcade. Using this modular scheme, the elevation of the cloister from pavement to roofline represents three of the modules in height and four in width with the ratio of the upper to lower arcade as 1:2.²¹

While Bruschi's proportional scheme is based on Letarouilly's nineteenth-century drawings whose original measurements may have been subject to 'tidying up',²² his reconstruction of Bramante's intentions is well supported by the kinds of recommendations made by Renaissance architectural theorists.²³ Whether or not Carafa himself would have been sensitive to these proportional relationships is far more speculative. As a man of some education and a patron of architecture, he could well have perused Vitruvius' and Alberti's treatises where these matters are treated in some detail. Although there is no documentary evidence that he did so, or that he had the sort of commitment to the practice of architecture generally attributed to such patrons as Cosimo de'Medici and Ludovico Gonzaga²⁴, in one of the many literary dedications to Carafa the cardinal is addressed as a mathematician.²⁵ This isolated tribute could indicate the kind of expertise which would relish the logical and harmonious proportions of Bramante's plan for the convent of Santa Maria della Pace.

The principal entrance to the conventual buildings is on the west side of the conventual building facing the Via Arco della Pace (Pl. 128, Fig. 4). The design of the doorway is characteristic of any number of doorways in fifteenth-century buildings in Rome as can be seen by comparing it to one of the entrance doorways commissioned by Cardinal Marco Barbo for the basilica of San Marco (cf. Pls. 128, 129). The convent doorway is further dignified by a lunette embellished by motifs which are highly classical in style (Pl. 130). In order to signal its religious function, a cross appears at its apex. Given the site, the lunette probably once enclosed a fresco depicting the Virgin Mary. As in the San Marco doorway, the lintel is decorated by the patron's coat of arms (Pls. 129, 130). On the frieze above the doorway is an inscription in lettering similar to the cloister frieze and giving Carafa's name and titles of Cardinal of Naples and Bishop of Ostia.²⁶ The doorway therefore postdates 1503 and was presumably executed late in the building programme. At the base of the doorway are two reliefs, one depicting the patron's impresa of the stadera and the other his impresa of the open book (Pls. 131, 132). Thus any person entering the convent could be left in no doubt whatsoever as to who was responsible for commissioning the building.

The entrance doorway leads via a short passageway to the cloister itself (Pl. 120). From Letarouilly's plan it appears that from the lower cloister walk the inmates and visitors to the convent had access to the north wing with its refectory (Fig. 4 d), kitchens and service courtyard, a suite of rooms in the east wing, and the church from the south-west corner (Fig. 4). On this plan, the room in the west wing

adjacent to the staircase is marked as a sacristy (Fig. 4 b). Given its proximity to the church, it could well have once functioned as a chapter house for the canons.²⁷ On the upper walk of the cloister, reached by a staircase on the north-west corner, individual cells are situated in the east and west wings. In the north wing over the refectory is another large hall which, on the basis of comparison with the arrangement at the Dominican priory of San Marco in Florence, could once have functioned as the library which Carafa took pride in claiming as his foundation in his last will and testament.²⁸

The proposed location and different functions of these various rooms receive support from the varied designs of their doorways and windows. In the north wing the doorways at either end of the cloister walk which lead to the refectory and rooms beyond have now been substantially altered. From Letarouilly's elevation, it appears that they were once identical in design and distinguished further by lunettes placed above the cornice of the north wall (Fig. 5). The doorway at the western end still displays similar decorative mouldings to the entrance doorway and is also embellished with Carafa's coat of arms on its lintel. The upper lunette is now open as a result of a campaign of work on the cloister directed by Domenico Fontana in the seventeenth century.²⁹ The doorway at the east end has now been plastered in.

Again from Letarouilly's elevation, it appears that the refectory was originally lit on the cloister side by series of four windows, one in each bay (Fig. 5). Below each window was another hollowed out of the thickness of the wall in order to give light and air to the semi-

subterranean basement rooms. Of this set of windows, only two (in the second and fifth bays) still retain their original framework (Pl. 133). The design of these windows is very simple and basically no different from the windows on the exterior west wall (cf. Pls. 117, 133). The placing of the upper window has been carefully calculated so that its upper moulding forms a continuous line with the cornice of the wall. Traces of colour embedded in the plasterwork are all that remains of a series of seventeenth-century frescoes.³⁰

On the east wall the doorway in the first bay is distinguished by finely beaded mouldings and egg and dart ornament on its cornice (Pl. 134). By comparison, the remaining four doorways are plainer in design. Each of the rooms behind receives light from a square window whose width precisely corresponds to the upper cornice of the doorway (Pl. 121). This arrangement is very Roman in style, deriving originally from the shop fronts of Antiquity and adopted in a number of fifteenth-century palaces.³¹ The six windows belonging to this suite of five rooms (one double the size of the others) can be seen from the Vicolo della Volpe (Pl. 127, Fig. 4). They are similar in design to the refectory windows. All the doorways carry Carafa's coat of arms on the lintel and his name and titles of Cardinal of Naples and Bishop of Sabina on the frieze.³² It seems, therefore, that this wing was the first part of the building to be executed in the early sixteenth-century campaign.

On the south side, the cloister runs adjacent to the church and there is therefore no space for any rooms on the three eastern bays of the cloister walk. On the three western bays, however, three doorways

originally provided access to the church via a number of rooms ingeniously designed to fit the triangular site between the convent and the church (Fig. 4). Today two of these doorways have been replaced by windows. On the west wall the southern bays were originally occupied by windows of a similar design to those of the refectory and exterior walls. In the fifth bay is the entrance to the staircase which leads to the upper part of the building. Over the landing appears the Carafa coat of arms (Pl. 135). Similarly, each corner vault of the cloister walk is marked out by the cardinal's heraldic device (Pl. 136). The present red terracotta pavement of the lower cloister walkways is nineteenth century. Below, two further layers of pavement have been discovered. The tiles of the lowest - and possibly original - pavement are set like the scales of a fish and are therefore similar in design to the few remaining fifteenth-century pavements that survive in a number of Roman churches.³³ A number of grill openings set at regular intervals in the pavement provide further ventilation for the basement rooms.

In the upper part of the building the pre-eminence of what was once probably the library is once again signalled by the distinctive design of its windows and of the adjacent doorways. The doorways are embellished with more decorative mouldings than those of the cells in the upper part of the convent. The arched windows are again very plain in design (Fig. 5). Those cell doorways that survive in their original form on the east and west sides of the building are similar to their counterparts in the east wing of the ground floor. In the fourth bay of

the southern upper passageway is a tablet which displays Carafa's coat of arms and imprese.

The upper cloister vault is not vaulted but covered by a timbered ceiling which is largely a work of reconstruction (Pl. 114, Fig. 6). Traces of white, yellow, purple and azure pigment found on its beams indicate that at some date it was embellished with polychrome decoration. There were also bands of decoration on the walls of the upper walkways but no sign of figurative murals.³⁶

One charming architectural detail of the convent has survived in the pairs of seats which were built within the thickness of the terrace wall in each bay (Fig. 6). The skilful and highly precise insertion of the seats in relationship to the bases of the columns and piers of the cloister arcade is indicative of the high quality of the stone masonry in the convent as a whole.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the cloister itself (Pl. 114). Compared to the modest architectural features of the conventual buildings,³⁷ the architectural syntax of the cloister is much more sophisticated. For this reason it tends to be analysed and treated in isolation from the buildings around it. However, since it shares its proportions with them it was apparently envisaged both as an integral part and culmination of the architectural scheme. In this respect the cloister accords with the recommendation given by Alberti in De Architectura:

The principal member of the whole building is that which I shall call the courtyard with its portico ...to which all the smaller members must correspond as being in a manner a market place to the whole house, which from this courtyard derives all the advantages of communication and light. For this reason everyone desires to have his courtyard as spacious, large, open, handsome and convenient as possible.³⁸

Vasari in his critical assessment of the cloister offers a mild reproof in that it 'non fusse di tutta bellezza'.³⁹ His valuation has tended to influence subsequent analysis of Bramante's elevational scheme in the cloister. A characteristic response is that of Carlo Ricci who states that Bramante, 'non era ancora così penetrato dal sentimento dell'antichità'.⁴⁰ In his exemplary study of the cloister Bruschi both supplies the reason for the uneasiness expressed and counters it with an explanation of why Bramante took the decisions he did:

Le più tipiche forme di portico, o loggiato, indicate dagli esempi romani quella dell'arco murario inquadrato dall'ordine architettonico ... e quella dell'ordine architravato. . . . A

S. Maria della Pace il programma edilizio prevede una costruzione a due piani. Appare pertanto "logico": o sovrapporre due ordini d'archi inquadrati da paraste concluse da trabeazioni, o introdurre due ordini architravati. . . . Bramante ha l'idea di sovrapporre i due sistemi. Ogni sospetto di licenza rispetto alle indicazioni degli antichi è allontanato dalla considerazione della maggiore logicità - costruttiva e pratica, ma soprattutto ideale, nella linea

dei precetti albertiani - di adottare un sistema murario al piano terreno, con ambienti più alti e coperti a volta, ed un sistema ad ordine architravato, nel piano superiore, più basso e con strutture orizzontali lignee, a sostenere la copertura'.⁴²

In a similarly inventive way, Bramante's treatment of the architectural orders both broke the rules of classical architecture and re-ordered them. Thus he adopted the canonic succession of orders - Doric, Ionic, Corinthian - as exemplified in such influential local prototypes as the Colosseum, but he chose to give precedence to the Ionic order, which according to Renaissance architectural theory symbolised feminine qualities.⁴³ This decision was entirely appropriate given the building's dedication to the Virgin Mary. Thus the elevation of the lower ground floor arcade was devoted to a series of Ionic pilasters (Pls. 115, 124). The first or Doric order was replaced by the Tuscan order with the profile of the piers, from which the arches of the lower arcade spring, being in itself treated as an order (Pl. 120). The Corinthian order was represented by the columns and the Composite by the piers of the upper arcade (Pls. 122, 123).

A number of anomalies are nevertheless set up by this ingenious if unorthodox system. In the upper arcade a series of composite pilasters corresponds in a most uncanonical way to a series of Corinthian columns (Pl. 114). In order to make the upper and lower arcades harmonise with one another, Bramante also ensured that the Ionic pilasters of the piers of the ground floor arcade were the same width as the composite pilasters on the piers of the upper arcade (Fig. 5). Both were further

distinguished by pedestals and on the upmost entablature the architrave and pairs of corbels in the frieze were made to project over the composite piers (Pls. 116, 122). The upper cornice however was left uninterrupted with the bizarre effect of a series of corbels protruding beyond the roofline at regular intervals.

The cruciform rectangular piers in the lower storey created further problems within the modular grid of squares which determined the plan and elevation of the cloister. In order to keep to it, the corner piers had to be compressed in order to approximate a square. As a result the Ionic pilaster was reduced to a 'thread' and the impost moulding of the arch thus became visually much stronger (Pls. 137, 138). On the upper arcades the corbels were similarly displaced and contracted (Pl. 139). In this courtyard the corners thus seem much weaker than the central piers and for this reason Bramante's design has been further criticised.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, as pointed out by Bruschi, by emphasising the central piers of the cloister and by extension its central axis, the illusion of the cloister as an organic centrepiece to the building is heightened.⁴⁵ Bruschi's point is confirmed by the fact that each of the central piers in the upper and lower arcades were once marked by Cardinal Carafa's coat of arms.⁴⁶ By thus acknowledging his patron's sponsorship of the building and by adopting an inventive approach to the rules and syntax of classical architecture, Bramante was able to triumph over the restrictions of the site and create a small but elegant residence for the Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation.

The Canons Regular were fortunate in their Cardinal Protector, who clearly took his duties seriously and had the personal contacts and judgement to acquire the services of the most talented but yet untried architect in Rome at that time. One of the canons, Girolamo Vida, acknowledged his community's good fortune by alluding to the cloister and its 'lofty columns' in his funeral oration composed in Carafa's honour.⁴⁷ As a sign of his continuing benevolence, Carafa bequeathed his private library to the convent,⁴⁸ and according to his seventeenth-century biographer, Chioccarello, a holding (vigna) outside the Porta del Popolo. In addition he may have presented an organ and tapestries to the church.⁴⁹

From the fictive architectural decoration of his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the architecture of the Succorpo, Carafa had already revealed himself as a patron who sponsored schemes which display a knowledge of classical architecture and an enthusiasm for the possibilities of its decorative repertoire. Vasari's account, while penned some sixty years after the Santa Maria della Pace commission, gives as the reason for Carafa's interest in Bramante the architect's archaeological investigations in Rome and Naples.⁵⁰ While this might be merely an example of one of Vasari's topoi, there is in fact good evidence that Carafa had a committed interest in antique sculptures and inscriptions. The richness and exuberance of the all'antica decoration, often deriving from authentic classical models, in both his funerary chapels further substantiate Vasari's suggestion. Thus Carafa must have endorsed, if not conferred with Bramante on, the design of the cloister and conventual buildings. The carved inscription of the

cloister frieze which advertises so boldly Cardinal Carafa's act of pious patronage is symptomatic of Carafa's ability to obtain work of a qualitatively high standard which explicitly commemorates his part in the venture. Such a leitmotiv is indicative of a person of decided views and commitment to the patronage of art, however much the latter activity might have also been determined by traditional expectations of what a Cardinal Protector should be seen to do in support of a religious order under his care.

The cloister of the Cisterna at Santa Maria sopra Minerva

Carafa also furnished the Dominican priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva with a cloister and range of conventual buildings around it. In this respect he was once again emulating his distinguished predecessor as Cardinal Protector of the Dominican Order, Cardinal Juan Torquemada (1388-1468).⁵¹ Torquemada had commissioned the embellishment of a cloister immediately adjacent to the north transept of the church. Leandro Alberti (1517) describes this commission as a series of pictures with explanatory epigrams.⁵² A record of this lost cycle of frescoes can be found in a series of meditations on the paintings penned by Torquemada himself. The Meditationes, commissioned in 1467 from the firm of Ulrich Hahn, is the earliest illustrated book printed in Italy. Thirty-four woodcuts depict the subject matter of this cycle drawn primarily from the Creation, the Infancy, Ministry and Passion of Christ, and the Last Judgement. A number represent aspects of Church dogma and one in particular alludes to the patron by portraying a Dominican cardinal kneeling before Saint Sixtus (Pl. 140), patron saint

of the church to which Torquemada was titular cardinal. It is unlikely, however, that the woodcuts reflect accurately the pictorial style of the cloister paintings.⁵³ The cloister itself was rebuilt during Vincenzo Giustiniani's term of office as Master General of the Order (1558-70).⁵⁴

By contrast, Carafa's commission was architectural in type. From an entry in a necrology composed in the 1570s for the Dominican priory of Santa Maria Novella, Florence, the building of a second cloister beside the entrance chapel of the priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva is attributed to Oliviero Carafa. According to this source, this second cloister had an upper storey and Carafa was responsible for a number of other buildings including a dormitory for the friars. An entry in a chronicle written at the Minerva in 1610 confirms the succinct information supplied by the earlier record. It states that the more 'private' cloister of the Cisterna was restored and rebuilt by Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, a great benefactor to the priory. An annotation made in 1706 adds that one wing of the cloister was occupied by the refectory, another by the kitchen, the third by the refectory for the sick, and the fourth by the passageway to these and other service rooms.⁵⁵

On the map of Giovanni Maggi (1625, reprinted by Carlo Losi, 1774) and of Giovanni Battista Falda (1676), the priory of Santa Maria sopra Minerva is shown with two cloisters situated on the north east side of the church.⁵⁶ The site of the cloister in question is now occupied by modern office buildings but traces of the courtyard and walls have survived. The well from which the cloister derives its name still

occupies the south-east corner of the garden courtyard. On the west side is a series of arches supported by five columns which were walled in at a later date. The monolithic columns are composed of various types of marble (black, white, cipollino and variegated). They therefore probably originated from antique monuments. The capitals are Corinthian (Pl. 141). On the wall above is the Carafa coat of arms with traces of red paint still visible on the carved relief. On the south side are six arches supported by marble columns. The windows on the wall above are fifteenth-century in design and framed in travertine. To the east, where the refectory would have originally stood, is a wall constructed in 1680.⁵⁷ There is no trace of the north side of the cloister.

The dating of the cloister of the Cisterna and the precise arrangement and original function of the rooms around it are not easy to determine. Respighi implies that the cloister was inspired by Bramante's work at Santa Maria della Pace.⁵⁸ However, judging by the style of what survives of the building, it is probably earlier in date. Tomei, on the basis of the similarity of the capitals to those used by Paul II's architects, dates the cloister shortly after 1470.⁵⁹ Since Carafa became Cardinal Protector in 1478 the cloister may well belong to the last years of that decade and to the early years of his official association with the Dominicans at Santa Maria sopra Minerva.

Respighi, on the basis of the eighteenth-century description of the layout of the claustral buildings, places the refectory for the sick to the west, the kitchens to the north, the refectory to the east and by

implication the passageway to the south. However, as demonstrated by Zucchi's more recent assessment of the history of the building of the priory, the extensive rebuilding undertaken by Vincenzo Giustiniani at the end of the sixteenth century - a campaign which effectively reduced the cloister of the Cisterna to a courtyard - puts the accuracy of this late source into doubt.⁶⁰

From the surviving evidence, such as it is, it would seem that the cloister of the Cisterna constituted a similar but less sophisticated version of the cloister and conventual buildings at Santa Maria della Pace. It was originally square in plan with a lower arcade of marble Corinthian columns supporting a sequence of cross vaults. The upper arcades were occupied by a series of rooms with windows opening onto the cloister courtyard. The lower arcade was constructed with expensive materials and the upper floor embellished by more simple means. Once again Carafa's role in the enterprise was commemorated by the inclusion of his coat of arms placed in a prominent position on the fabric of the building.

San Lorenzo fuori le Mura

In his entry for January 1511, the Venetian chronicler, Sanudo, refers to San Lorenzo fuori le Mura as one of the benefices that needed to be redistributed as a result of the death of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa.⁶¹ Carafa was thus abbot in commendam of the Benedictine abbey attached to this ancient and greatly revered church. In 1511, the year of his death, the church was consigned to the care of the Canons Regular of San

Giovanni in Lateran.⁶² Given Carafa's connections with that order, it is likely that, before his death, he made arrangements for this transfer.

Albertini (1510) states that San Lorenzo fuori le Mura was also the object of Carafa's patronage and that the cardinal had restored the church and embellished it with a gold ceiling and various pictures. Fra Mariano in his 1518 itinerary of the city repeats Albertini's brief description virtually word for word.⁶³

Nothing remains today of Carafa's embellishment other than a set of coat of arms placed on the wall of the narthex together with those of Julius II and of the House of Aragon (Pls. 142-144). Since these heraldic devices were once on the facade of the church,⁶⁴ Carafa may also have restored the facade after 1503 (the year of Julius II's elevation to the papacy). The presence of the royal coat of arms implies a Spanish interest in the basilica. Since the relics of the revered third-century Spanish saint, Saint Lawrence, reside within the church, it is likely that the Spanish monarchs would wish to be associated with the upkeep of the basilica. Furthermore Carafa's close diplomatic relations with Spain make such an association all the more plausible.

As indicated in the analysis of both Carafa's chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the Succorpo, certain features of these chapels' decoration appear to have been adopted from San Lorenzo. At the eastern end of San Lorenzo (which incorporates a fifth-century church⁶⁵) the chancel is raised above the level of the nave and contains a crypt below

it. The relics of the two most celebrated deacon martyrs, Stephen and Lawrence, are housed in this semi-subterranean crypt. Although the crypt was re-excavated in the nineteenth century, the present arrangement would have been visible during the period of Carafa's tutelage of the church (Pl. 98). Behind the high altar in the upper part of the chancel is a fine thirteenth-century episcopal throne (Pl. 110). As suggested in chapter five, the introduction of a crypt beneath the chancel and the placing of the episcopal throne behind the altar are distinctive features of the Succorpo (Pl. 86). The pavements in the chancel, nave and aisles of San Lorenzo represent magnificent examples of Cosmati work. In Carafa's two chapels, the pavements display similar materials to and the intricate patterning of these early examples (Pls. 26, 84). A number of other decorative details from the basilica recur in the Carafa chapel schemes. The thirteenth-century gospel ambo has a relief of an eagle with its prey in its talons (Pl. 145). This motif is re-used in both the Minerva tomb chamber vault and the carved decoration of the Succorpo (Pl. 23, 92). An antique frieze depicting a series of sacrificial objects, then housed in San Lorenzo, was also utilised by Filippino Lippi for the decorative framework of the Minerva chapel frescoes (Pls. 74, 75).

As indicated by Albertini, Carafa's campaign of restoration entailed a painted and gilded ceiling. This was placed over the thirteenth-century western church and was destroyed in the restoration campaign conducted in 1855-1867.⁶⁷ A manuscript compilation of inscriptions and epitaphs by an anonymous author writing during the reign of Pius V (1566-1572) records an inscription in gold letters on this ceiling, which gives the

date, 1492, and describes Oliviero Carafa, Cardinal of Naples and Bishop of Sabina, as the patron who dedicates this work to Saints Stephen and Lawrence whose bodies await resurrection in their tomb.⁶² On the basis of this record of the ceiling's inscription, this phase of Carafa's patronage of the basilica took place in the last years of the work on the chapel at Santa Maria sopra Minerva and before the initiation of the schemes of the Succorpo and Santa Maria della Pace.

Carafa apparently also commissioned a painting on the arcade of the eastern church or chancel of San Lorenzo. From another manuscript description, it seems that it showed the Madonna with Saint Lawrence on the right and Saint Stephen on the left. Above these figures was the Carafa coat of arms.⁶³ All that survives today is the sixth-century mosaic of God the Father and saints set on the inner face of the triumphal arch which separates the chancel from the main body of the church.

Carafa appears once again as a patron concerned for the upkeep and decorative splendour of this ancient basilica placed under his care. Such was his respect for this church and its antiquity that he may well have specifically instructed artists in his employ to emulate certain features of its design and interior embellishment in other projects which he commissioned, such as the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the Succorpo.

Other churches in Rome

In his will (1509) Carafa left specified sums of money to finance the celebration of requiem masses in a number of Roman churches. One such bequest was made to the Franciscans at Santa Maria in Aracoeli, a church whose south aisle vaulting Carafa had had constructed between September 1467 and March 1468. Carafa's coat of arms appears three times as the central bosses of alternating vaults in the south aisle of this Roman church. Since these are notably absent in the vaulting of the north aisle, whose construction is slightly different from that of the south aisle, Malmstrom's contention that Carafa was only responsible for the latter is borne out by the visual evidence. Carafa's patron, Paul II, assumed the cost of the construction of the church's roof.⁷⁰ Carafa also left to the monastery of the Celestines two hundred ducats for the repair of the church of Sant'Eusebio.⁷¹ Sant'Eusebio was one of the ancient titular churches in Rome and had been under Carafa's jurisdiction as Cardinal Presbyter between 1470 and 1476. It has been suggested that Carafa financed restoration of the church and monastery as early as 1471 when Sixtus IV transferred the Celestines from San Pietro in Montorio to Sant'Eusebio. Pompeo Ugonio (1588) cites the presence of the Carafa coat of arms in the church,⁷² but this device could have commemorated his relative, Antonio Carafa, who was Cardinal Presbyter of Sant'Eusebio between 1568 and 1573. There is no physical evidence left today of Carafa's patronage in the church which was extensively redecorated by Stefano Fontana in the early seventeenth century. Chioccarello (1643) also refers to Carafa's gift of an organ

to San Pietro in Vincoli.⁷³ No further historical evidence has so far been uncovered to confirm or deny Chioccarello's statement.

In these five (or possibly six) cases Carafa can be judged as a patron of ecclesiastical commissions which were designed to serve the needs of the public be they religious communities or the world at large. He also acquired for himself residential accommodation in the ancient city centre and on the outskirts of Rome. While these residences were designed in the first instance for his private needs, they too fulfilled certain public functions.

The villa on the Quirinal

While Cardinal Carafa may have owned several rural properties on the outskirts of Rome,⁷⁴ all designated as vigne, the most remarkable was his vigna on the Quirinal. In a papal bull issued by Alexander VI on March 24, 1502, Cardinal Carafa was given special permission as a cleric to designate his brothers, Alessandro and Ettore, heirs to this property.⁷⁵ As early as 1476 or thereabouts, Carafa's secretary, Andrea Brenta, describes this villa as a delightful and healthy refuge from the crowded and unhealthy conditions of the plague-ridden city.⁷⁶ It also appears from the title of a lost dialogue on nobility by another eminent humanist at the papal curia, Raffaello Lippo Brandolino, that this villa was once very elegant.⁷⁷ In 1482, Giovanni Lorenzi describes to Cardinal Marco Barbo a visit made by Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon to Carafa's villa. On this occasion the young cardinal had supper and stayed overnight. The next morning Cardinal Regino (Pietro Isvalies)

arrived for lunch and after this meal the Vice-Chancellor (Rodrigo Borgia) joined the party.⁷⁹ In 1496, Ermolao Barbaro used the villa as a refuge from the plague.⁸⁰ A later visitor to the villa was the young Federigo Gonzaga, who, as hostage to Julius II between 1510 and 1513, was entertained at the villa by the antics of the pope's buffoon, Fra Mariano.⁸¹ Albertini (1510) describes the villa as a house built with customary elegance and adorned by vines, plants, pictures, epitaphs and epigrams; Fra Mariano (1518) adds marble statues to this list of delights.⁸¹

In the fifteenth century, the Quirinal hill was a quiet uninhabited zone on the outskirts of the city, largely populated by vineyards and the occasional neglected or abandoned church. The area was transversed by the ancient Via Alta Semita (widened in 1561 to form the Via Pia) which led to the Porta Nomentana. The remains of a number of ancient monuments had also survived, the most notable being the thermae of Constantine (now incorporated into the Palazzo Pallavicini-Rospigliosi) and the facade of the temple of Serapis which, due to its distinctive pediment, was called the Frontespizio di Nerone.⁸² The gigantic sculpted group of the Horse-tamers or Dioscuri and the pair of River Gods (now on the Campidoglio) were also situated on the Quirinal, hence its popular name of Monte Cavallo.⁸³ Due to its pleasant elevated location and its classical associations, the Quirinal gradually became the locus of a number of suburban residences owned by clerical or lay curialists. Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga had a house beside the church of Santa Agata dei Goti and the humanist Pompanazzo Leto also built a residence on the hillside. In the early sixteenth century these were

joined by the villas of Cardinal Carpi and the Florentine banker, Leonardo Boccaccio.⁸⁴

Some years after Carafa's death, the villa on the Quirinal was first rented by the Farnese family,⁸⁵ and subsequently by Cardinal Ippolito d'Este. From a contract made on 2 May, 1565, between Cardinal d'Este and the Carafa d'Andria, reference is made to Oliviero Carafa and his 1502 bequest of the property to his brothers, Alessandro and Ettore. Cardinal d'Este furthermore undertook to pay 2000 scudi as annual rent for a viridarium with two palaces, vineyards and gardens.⁸⁶ On his death in 1572, the property became the residence of Luigi d'Este who apparently placed it at the disposal of Gregory XIII. Gregory's predecessor Paul III had earlier expressed a wish that the villa become a papal residence and in June, 1587, Sixtus V made this hope a reality, by purchasing the property from the Carafa d'Andria. The villa thereafter became the subject of an extensive building programme which continued throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when the papal palace became the official residence of the Savoy kings. It is currently the official residence of the President of Italy.⁸⁷

In Leonardo Bufalini's plan of Rome (1551) the site of the Cardinal of Ferrara's vigna is clearly marked as lying at the north-west end of the Via Alta Semita (marked Vemita on the plan) with the vigna of Leonardo Boccaccio beside it. In Stefano Dupérac's view of the location (1577) the Villa d'Este is shown as an extensive garden lying parallel to Via Pia (Alta Semita), bisected by a wall at right angles to the road and

with two buildings set at the west end of the property. One of these buildings is situated on the south west directly beside the Via Pia and facing onto the piazza of Monte Cavallo; the other on the north west and therefore located well inside the property.²⁸ Hülsen, by combining the evidence of these two pictorial sources and the cryptic description given in the 1565 contract, proposes that Carafa's vigna originally comprised a large garden subdivided by a long wall and two separate houses set at the west end of the property.²⁹ Jack Wasserman's discovery and careful analysis of an anonymous sixteenth-century plan of the vigna, which he dates quite properly to around 1568 (and therefore during Cardinal Ippolito d'Este's period of residence), provides a more exact idea of what Carafa's villa once looked like (Fig. 7).³⁰ From the information provided by this plan, it appears that the northernmost building shows definite signs of being extended from an earlier structure. This latter feature, Wasserman argues, represents Oliviero Carafa's original residence. In its original form the villa must therefore have represented a simple L-shaped building with three rooms on the ground floor and access to the upper buildings provided by an external staircase. Wasserman's reconstruction receives confirmation from Bufalini's plan (1551) which shows a L-shaped building located on the north-west edge of the Quirinal hill and with steps down to a road to the city below. Thus Carafa's residence must once have commanded a stunning view of the city, a recommendation made by Alberti for such rural retreats.³¹

Wasserman further elaborates upon his reconstruction by his observation that a mural in the Sala Terrena of the Villa d'Este at Tivoli portrays

the cardinal's property on the Quirinal and that, on the evidence of this topographical detail, it can be assumed that Carafa's villa once had a tower capped with crenellations.³² From Wasserman's able reconstruction,³³ one can conclude that, while Carafa's villa was made the more distinctive by its tower (a feature of a number of monumental Roman palaces, Pl. 146), it was, in the last analysis, a fairly modest residence typical of the casino type of building best represented by Cardinal Bessarion's suburban villa on the Via Appia (Pl. 147).³⁴

Albertini describes the villa as notable for its horticulture and its display of ancient funerary monuments inscribed with epigrams. As such, this garden would have been one of the earliest to be devoted to the display of Roman antiquities.³⁵ Jacopo Mazzochio, epigrapher and printer (who was also responsible for the publication of at least two of the pasquinades issued during Carafa's lifetime) published two inscriptions from Carafa's villa in his Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis (1521).³⁶ In 1592, Schrader published a number of others in his Monumentorum Italiae. Four of these epigrams are recorded in Greek and eight in Latin. Amongst the sources cited are Hesiod's Works and Days, Virgil's Georgics, Pliny the Elder's Natural History, together with Pliny's records of Columella's and Cato's treatises on rustic matters.³⁷

As noted in chapter three, Andrea Brenta may well have supplied Carafa with at least two of the Greek epigrams and the cardinal would have been familiar with Pliny's Natural History through Benedetto Maffei's treatment of this work in a presentation copy made for him.³⁸ All the epigrams recorded by Schrader are derived from classical authors or

poets discoursing on the merits of rural and agricultural life. Given the location of the villa and its function as a country retreat, this choice of texts for the embellishment of its garden would have been entirely apposite. They also act as further confirmation of the health-giving qualities attributed to the villa in a number of contemporary accounts. Nevertheless, one aspect of Carafa's own health apparently suffered in his rural retreat. According to Paolo Cortese (1510) the cardinal was allergic to the smell and touch of dying roses. Giovanni Pietro Valeriano expands on this comment in his Hieroglyphicorum where he relates that Carafa had to station guards at the entrance of his villa in order to prevent his friends bringing him gifts of this species of flower.⁹⁹

As an owner, Carafa was a hospitable man, as one learns from contemporary accounts of the villa and the dedication inscription which once graced its entrance. It ran: 'the pious Oliviero, illustrious offspring and cardinal of learned Naples, dedicates this villa of perpetual health set on the suburban Esquiline (sic) hill and says to all his friends come as guests'.¹⁰⁰ As noted by David Coffin, Carafa was following here the ancient principle of lex hortorum which states that gardens were created not only for the personal enjoyment of their owners but to afford pleasure to others. Although in this inscription Carafa's invitation is only addressed to his friends, in the sixteenth century this custom was extended to members of the general public who were able to visit such gardens as those of the Villas Medici and Julia.¹⁰¹

The vigna on the Quirinal thus comprised a building which would not have been remarkable in terms of its size and architectural embellishment. But it clearly set a number of precedents which were taken up by the designers of the series of magnificent villas and gardens built on the outskirts of Rome during the sixteenth century. Its garden was designed to emulate the gardens of antiquity and in its style of decoration deliberately sought to highlight the salubrious nature of the villa's location. Nor was it intended merely as a private retreat for its owner and his intimate circle of friends but, on occasion, performed a more public and ceremonial function when Carafa entertained official guests amidst his villa's cultivated surroundings.

The Palazzo Orsini

The earliest topographical reference to Cardinal Carafa's principal residence in Rome is in Burchard's entry for Sunday, 28 June, 1489, where the writer describes a procession held in honour of Niccolo Orsini passing by the palace of the Cardinal of Naples. From this and other references made by Burchard,¹⁰² it is clear that this palace was located on the Via Papalis, the principal route from the Vatican to San Giovanni in Laterano and therefore frequently the focus of civic ritual.¹⁰³

The history of this palace began shortly after 1450 when Francesco Orsini, Duke of Gravina, who had been made Prefect of Rome in 1435 by Eugenius IV, built a palace between the Via Papalis and the present Piazza Navona. The latter was known then as the Piazza Agens and consisted of a field surrounded by buildings built over the Stadium of

Domitian. At the death of Francesco in 1456 the palace was inherited by his brother Giacomo, who rented it out to various high-ranking ecclesiastics. The first tenant was Oliviero Carafa who, as described in chapter three, placed the statue of Pasquino on one corner of the palace.¹⁰⁴ After his death in 1511, it was inhabited by Cardinal Bainbridge until his assassination in 1514. In 1516 it was rented by Cardinal Antonio del Monte who had it renovated by Antonio Sangallo the Younger. In 1533, the Orsini family took up residence again. The palace was demolished in 1791 to make way for the present Palazzo Braschi.¹⁰⁵

It is clear, however, from a number of pictorial sources dating from before its demolition that the Palazzo Orsini shared the present palace's irregular site. In addition, there are two plans that have survived of the early palace. The first dates from the sixteenth century, and while it principally shows the south wing of the palace and its subdivision into shops, it also indicates the entrance portico and the position of the main stairs (Fig. 8). The second is an eighteenth-century plan of the piano nobile which shows the disposition of the upper rooms and also names the streets around the building (Fig. 9).¹⁰⁶

While there is no conclusive evidence that these plans do not include later additions to the palace which postdate Carafa's period of occupation, a late fifteenth-century description of the palace refers to the principal entrance being set to one side and a spacious courtyard with a single loggia within it.¹⁰⁷ All these features are visible on the sixteenth-century plan (Fig. 8). From the visual evidence supplied

by these two plans, the following tentative observations can be made about the design and layout of Carafa's city domicile. The main entrance was located on the Via Papalis (the present Via di S. Pantaleo) and led into a large central courtyard via a loggia of four bays. There was a second entrance on the Piazza Navona facade with an inscription over it giving the name and title of the palace's first owner, Francesco Orsini.¹⁰⁸ The main staircase was located at the south end of the ground floor entrance loggia (Fig. 8). A large hall was located on the piano nobile of the west wing with a suite of smaller rooms on the north (Fig. 9).¹⁰⁹

From a number of seventeenth-century views of the palace taken from the Piazza di Pasquino,¹¹⁰ and therefore towards its principal entrance, the building apparently comprised three storeys with its facade dressed in stone and divided by two string courses. The entrance portal was set asymmetrically with one ground floor window to the left and two to the right. Eight windows provided light to the piano nobile. In the bird's eye view of the palace given in a number of seventeenth-century maps, the palace is made distinctive by its courtyard and tower, situated on the north-east corner of the building.¹¹¹ This tower appears to the left of the palace facade in an engraving (1642) of the Piazza Navona by Israel Silvestre.¹¹² Although it has been proposed that the tower was commissioned from Bramante by Carafa, it is more likely that it was constructed during Cardinal del Monte's period of residence. According to Vasari, who refers to it as a commission by Cardinal del Monte to Antonio Sangallo the Younger, it was three storeys high, decorated by

pilasters and windows and had sculpted figures and scenes on both the exterior and interior.¹¹³

In the sixteenth-century plan, the southern part of the building is depicted as accomodating a number of shops and small internal courtyards (Fig. 8). These shops would therefore have faced onto what is now the Piazza di San Pantaleo and the Via della Cuccagna. They may not have belonged to the palace, but it was common practice for urban residences of this type to have shops or workshops on the ground floor opening onto the street. The palace owner would then receive the financial benefit from the rent paid on these properties. One striking example of such an arrangement survives in the south wing of the Cancelleria.¹¹⁴

Despite the slender historical evidence for the layout and appearance of the Palazzo Orsini, a number of points of comparison can be made between it and the advice given by Paolo Cortese on the design and function of a cardinal's palace in De Cardinalatu.¹¹⁵ Cortese was of course writing some fifty years later than the Palazzo Orsini's construction. He therefore had the benefit of far more ambitious schemes for palace design on which to draw. However, in certain of its features, the Palazzo Orsini does anticipate quite closely Cortese's recommendations and they are therefore worthwhile considering, particularly since they help to reconstruct something of the kind of environment in which Carafa himself would have lived.

Cortese begins his analysis of a cardinal's palace by stating that it should be situated either in the heart of the city in order to

facilitate the transaction of business or far away from the most densely populated areas in order to pursue study. It should be near the Vatican so that the cardinal could easily attend religious services and consistorial sittings. Another advantage of a central location would be that the cardinal was easily accessible to petitioners. He cites the palaces of Sisto della Rovere and Raffaele Riario (the Cancelleria) as examples of palaces with such advantageous locations.¹⁶ Like these cardinals' palaces, the Palazzo Orsini was also located in the busy commercial centre of Rome and its situation on the main public route to the Vatican made it highly convenient for the transaction of curial business.

Cortese also reminds the reader that the cardinal as head of the household had a moral responsibility towards its members. The palace should be removed from attractions likely to excite the evils of gluttony and lust. The Palazzo Orsini's location did not offer protection of this sort. The moral welfare of Carafa's household had to depend rather on the example of its head. Judging by the comments made by Brenta, Sadoletto and Vida on the high moral tone of the cardinal's household, Carafa succeeded in exercising this kind of control.¹⁷

Cortese's recommendations to the cardinal owner on how to secure a healthy site for his palace do not relate to the orientation of the Palazzo Orsini. Certain details, however, do accord with Cortese's precepts. From its sixteenth-century plan (Fig. 8) the palace once fulfilled, in part, Cortese's basic criteria of a courtyard (atrium) surrounded by loggias. An annotation on the plan also marks the room

beside the entrance to the palace as the room of the grooms, thus following the arrangement described by Cortese where the grooms' room and the tack room should be situated beside the entrance passage (andito) with a vaulted armoury nearby.¹¹⁹ Carafa, like any high-ranking ecclesiastic, would have kept a large stable and the necessary means of defence to protect himself and his household during such periods of civil disturbance as the occupation of Rome by French troops during the winter of 1494/5.

In his discussion of the ground floor of the palace, Cortese recommends that the guest rooms should be situated behind the courtyard loggias and the cardinal's library placed in the eastern ground-floor wing in order that it be lit by the morning light. It should also be easily accessible to outside visitors. Close by should be a circular vaulted lecture hall and a music room. The ground floor should also contain a courtroom, household offices, a dining and breakfast room, kitchens and pantries.¹²⁰ Although it is impossible to tell from the plan whether the Palazzo Orsini contained such extensive facilities, Carafa would have regularly offered hospitality to visiting dignitaries, and so certain rooms in the palace would have been used for their accommodation. Visitors to the palace to petition on behalf of Savonarola also reported that the palace was filled with books on theology, philosophy and jurisprudence.¹²⁰ Given his later generosity to the Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation, there is every possibility that Carafa, like his fellow cardinals, placed the contents of his private library at the disposal of other scholars.

Cortese continues his description of the palace by specifying that the entrance to the main staircase should be from the north ground floor loggia and therefore not from the entrance loggia, which he places on the east side of the building. In the Palazzo Orsini, access to the main staircase was from the entrance loggia (Pl.39) as in the case of the Cancelleria. Its dogleg type was, however, the form of staircase recommended by Cortese.¹²¹

In the case of the piano nobile, Cortese proposes that the great hall, which should be spacious enough for public gatherings of a ceremonial nature, should face east and be over the entrance wing. A chapel and audience chamber should open from the hall. Nearby should be the main dining room overlooking a covered walk or garden, a silver closet, and a night study. The main bedroom should have access to the library and be near the gem room. The palace should also be provided with secretaries' rooms, a room for accountants and studios for artists.¹²² It can be only a matter of speculation which of the rooms depicted on the eighteenth-century plan fulfilled such functions. It is likely, however, that the larger room shown on the west wing once acted as the great hall as described by Cortese (Fig. 9). It would also appear from Filippino Lippi's letter of 1489 that he had accommodation in the palace during his period of work on the Carafa chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva.¹²³ Whether he was also furnished with studio facilities can only be surmised.

Cortese's remarks on the type of exterior and interior embellishment to be emulated are ultimately most apposite for Carafa's ecclesiastical

commissions. His arguments on the advantages that accrue to the owner if he display his magnificence by the use of travertine and the antique orders on the exterior of the palace are directly applicable to Carafa's cloister at Santa Maria della Pace. Cortese himself, when discussing suitable kinds of decoration for the private chapel of the palace, cites Carafa's chapel at Santa Maria sopra Minerva.¹²⁴ By living in rented accommodation Carafa could turn his energies and material resources as a patron towards other outlets. While apparently depriving himself of the opportunity to establish his and his family's reputation in Rome by building a monumental urban residence, he chose instead to embellish a number of the city's churches and conventual buildings.¹²⁵ Through a series of well-advertised acts of public munificence, he was thus able to enhance his own image and that of the Church he served.

Notes to chapter 6

¹DEO OPTIMO MAXIMO ET DIVE MARIE VIRGINI GLORIOSE DEIPARE/
CANONICIS QUAE REGULARIBUS CONGREGATIONIS LATERANENSIS/ OLIVERIUS
CARRAPHA EPISCOPIUS HOSTIENSIS CARDINALIS NEAPOLITANUS/ PIE A
FUNDAMENTIS EREXIT ANNO SALUTIS CHRISTIANE MDIIII.

²See below, pp. 332, 336-40.

³See above, chapter 3, note 10.

⁴Albertini, Opusculum de mirabilibus Romae, III, , fol.
82r: 'Ecclesiae S. Mariae de pace Syxto IIII fundata, postea vero ab
Oliverio Carrapha Cardinalis Neapolitano exornata'.

⁵Vasari-Milanesi, IV, p. 154: 'Bramante ...desideroso poter viver
del suo, ed insieme, senza avere a lavorare, potere agiatamente misurare
tutte le fabbriche antiche di Roma. E messovi mano, solitario e
cogitativo se n'andava: e fra non molto spazio di tempo misurò quanti
edifizj erano in quella città e fuori per la campagna; e parimente fece
fino a Napoli, e dovunque e'sapeva che fossero cose antiche. Misuro ciò
che era a Tiboli ed alla villa Adriana; e, come si dirà poi al suo
luogo, se ne servì assai. E scoperto in questo modo l'animo di
Bramante, il Cardinale di Napoli, datoli d'occhio, prese a favorirlo:
dove Bramante seguitando lo studio, essendo venuto voglia al cardinal
detto di far rifare a'frati della Pace il chiostro di trevertino, ebbe
il carico di questo chiostro. Per il che desiderando di acquistare e di
gratuirsi molto quel cardinale, si messe all'opera con ogni industria e
diligenza, e prestamente e perfettamente la condusse al fine. Ed
ancora che egli non fusse di tutta bellezza, gli diede grandissimo nome,
per non essere in Roma molti che attendessino all'architettura con tanto
amore, studio e prestezza, quanto Bramante'. In the 1550 edition,
pp. 596-7, Vasari omits his account of Bramante's archaeological studies
but describes Carafa's commission to Bramante in identical terms.

⁶Franzini, Descrizione di Roma, p. 190, Roiseco, Roma antica e
moderna II, pp. 76-8, do, however, attribute the completion of the
conventual buildings to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. Roiseco ibid., and
Martinelli, Roma ricercata p. 164, also name the cloister as amongst the
first of Bramante's buildings in Rome.

⁷For the bibliography on Bramante and the cloister, see Bruschi,
Bramante architetto, pp. 249-90. To this should be added ibid.,
Bramante (2nd ed., London, 1977), pp. 71-85, 201; P. Marconi, 'Il
chiostro di Santa Maria della Pace in Roma', Studi Bramanteschi (Rome,
1974), pp. 427-36.

⁸The incipit runs: 'Reverendissimo patri et amplissimo domino
Oliverio tu[n]c Alban[us] Sabin[us] Episcopo Cardinali Neapolitano
dignissimo: de laudibus pacis: Benedictus Maffeus maioris preside[n]tie
Abbreviator apostolicus salutem et foelicitatem dicit'. In this
tribute, Maffei refers in fulsome terms to Sixtus IV's achievements as a
patron of the arts and learning. He ends with a tribute to Carafa,
praising his lineage, learning in the liberal arts and the law, and

abilities as a statesman. See also above, chapter 3, p. 127 and note 102.

⁹See Tomei, L'architettura a Roma, pp. 129-131; Urban, 'Die Kirchenbaukunst in Rom', IX-X, 1961-2, pp. 176-8.

¹⁰Cited by Howe, The hospital of Santo Spirito p. 377: 'aedem sacram deiparae Virginis titulo pacis in ipso urbi medio eo quo praefulgit splendore coenobium in super illi contiguum maxima ex parte extrvit quae beati Augustini ordinis regularibus canonicis e lateranensi basilica evocatis ascribit'. The mural is illustrated ibid., Pl.41.

¹¹Marconi, 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 427, who refers more specifically to the nature of the construction on the inner west wall facing the courtyard. Any reference to the technical construction of the building is indebted to Marconi's findings during his survey of the convent.

¹²Widloecher, La congregazione, passim, gives a detailed account of the early history of the history of the Congregation of the Canons Regular at Santa Maria di Fregionia, near Lucca, and its close association with the reformed houses at San Giorgio in Alga (in the Venetian lagoon) and Santa Giustina in Padua. See esp. ch. 4, pp. 73-92, ch. 8, pp. 213-218, where the author refers in some detail to the unsuccessful attempts by Eugenius IV and Paul II to establish the new Congregation at San Giovanni in Lateran in place of the Secular Canons.

¹³See above, chapter 2, p. 62.

¹⁴Vasari-Milanesi, IV, p. 153.

¹⁵Bruschi, Bramante, p. 71

¹⁶Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 35. See also above, chapter 2, p. 54.

¹⁷The contents of these documents will be discussed below, pp. 332-3.

¹⁸OLIVERIO [sic] CARRAPH[A]E CARD[INALI] NEAP[OLITANO]/FUNDATORI PIENTISS[IMO]/ PROTECTORI/ BEN[E]MEREN[TI]/ CANONICI REGULARES/ POS[UIT]/ ANNO SALUT[IS]/ MDIII. Chacón, Vita et res gestae col. 1101 gives an emended version of this inscription.

¹⁹Rome, Archivio Canonici Regulari Lateranensi di S. Pietro in Vincoli, fondo S. Maria della Pace (E n. 39), first published in C. Ricci, 'Il chiostro della Pace', Nuova antologia, I (1915), pp. 361-7. See Appendix IV for a transcription of these documents.

²⁰P. Letarouilly, édifices de Rome moderne ou recueil des palais, maisons, églises, couvents et autres monuments (Paris, 1868), I, Pl. 63 (my Fig. 4).

²¹Bruschi, Bramante, p. 74 and figs. 81-5, with extended explanatory captions.

²²For example, in his elevation Letarouilly, édifices de Rome, Pl. 64 (my Fig. 5), shows a series of blocks on the cornice of the lower entablature which correspond to the columns of the arcade above. Modern investigation has revealed no signs of these slabs.

²³Bramante's expertise in mathematical proportions was undoubtedly informed by Vitruvius and in particular Book VI, where the author treats this subject in some detail. His knowledge of Vitruvius would have been acquired from a MS copy of Alberti's De re aedificatoria or possibly, given his Milanese background, the preparatory drafts of Fra Giocondo's M. Vitruvius per Iocundum Solitor Castigator factus (Venice, 1511). Something of Bramante's theoretical knowledge can be gauged from his pupil, Cesare Cesariano, Di L. Vitruvio Pollione, De Architectura libri decem traducto de Latino in Vulgare affigurati (Como, 1521). The modern bibliography on the subject of harmonic proportion in Renaissance architecture is extensive and ever-growing. One of the best remains R. Wittkower, Architectural principles in the age of humanism (reprint, London, 1971).

²⁴Gombrich, 'The early Medici as patrons of art', *passim*; A. D. Fraser Jenkins, 'Cosimo de' Medici's patronage of architecture and the theory of magnificence', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXIII (1970), pp. 162-70; H. Burns, 'The Gonzaga and Renaissance architecture', catalogue essay in Splendours of the Gonzaga, eds. D.S. Chambers and J. Martineau (London, 1981), pp. 27-38, esp. 27-30.

²⁵In the dedication (fol. 1v) to the 1505 edition of De nostrarum calamitatum causis liber (see above, chapter 3, note 101), the author, Agostino Nifo, addresses Oliviero Carafa as: 'tu qui idem et philosophus et mathematicus es'.

²⁶OLIVERIUS CARRAPHA EPISCOPUS HOSTIENSIS CARDINALIS NEAPOLITANUS.

²⁷In the Dominican priories of Santa Maria Novella and San Marco in Florence, the chapter houses are situated within easy access to the church. See the plans in T.C.L.: Firenze e dintorni, (6th ed., Milan, 1974), p. 242 (F) and p. 270 (no. 25). Certain liturgical rituals performed by religious communities began at the chapter house and continued with a procession to the church. See Gardner, 'The chapterhouse frescoes in Santa Maria Novella', p. 111.

²⁸See T.C.L.: Firenze, p. 242 and above, chapter 3, n. 10.

²⁹Marconi, 'Il chiostro della Pace', pp. 429-436, who illustrates, tav. CLIX, 10, a drawn elevation from G. Fontana, Raccolta delle migliori chiese di Roma (Rome, 1838), II, tav. L, where all the principal doorways on the west side of the convent show evidence of remodelling. From this elevation, it is apparent that Letarouilly's

drawings represent his conception of what the building originally looked like.

³⁰Ibid., 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 428.

³¹Two examples of this arrangement can be seen on the north flank of the Casa Cavalieri di Rodi, built c. 1460-70, and the ground floor of the Cancelleria, built c. 1488-95, 1503-11, facing the Via Pellegrini. These rooms were rented out as shops. See Tomei L'architettura a Roma, p. 223; Magnuson Studies in architecture pp. 50-1, Pl. 10.

³²OLI[VERIUS] EPI[SCOPUS] SABIN[ENSIS] CAR[DINALIS] NEAP[OLITANUS] DE CARRAFIS.

³³Marconi, 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 429.

³⁴A number of epitaphs and two wall tombs are set in the walls of the north and east cloister walks. One, the tomb of Bishop Giovanni Andrea Bocciacio (d. 1497), Bishop of Modena, papal legate to Ferrante of Naples and ambassador to Ercole d'Este, has been attributed to either the school of Bregno or Luigi Capponi. See G. S. Davies, The sculptured tombs of the fifteenth century in Rome (London, 1910), p. 292, fig. 73; L.C.I. Roma (6th ed., Milan, 1962), p. 204. The other belongs to one Lorenzo Gerusino, who, according to his epitaph, erected by his mother, died unexpectedly at the age of thirty-seven in November 1498. Listed by Davies, ibid., p. 240, fig. 74, in Santa Margherita, Rome. Judging from the crude plasterwork around both these tombs, they appear to have been removed from other sites and set into the cloister wall at some later date.

³⁵Above the doors set at the eastern end of the library is a window whose design suggests that it was inserted there as part of Domenico Fontana's seventeenth-century campaign.

³⁶Marconi, 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 429.

³⁷The style of the doorways is typical of the interior doorways of the Palazzo Venezia (begun in 1455 and substantially complete by 1471). The windows of the Pace cloister are extremely simple in style and may possibly have adopted the form of those in the earlier building.

³⁸Ten books on architecture by Leone Battista Alberti. Translated into the Italian by Cosimi Bartoli and English by James Leoni. Venetian architect, ed. J. Rykwert (London, 1955), Bk V, ch.xvii, p. 105.

³⁹See above, note 5.

⁴⁰Ricci, 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 364.

⁴¹See Magnuson Studies in architecture, pp. 271-6, Pl. 41.

⁴²Bruschi, Bramante architetto, pp. 252-4.

⁴³This anthropological approach to the orders receives its most articulate treatment in Sebastiano Serlio, Regole generali di architettura sopra le cinque maniere degli edifici (Venice, 1537), Book IV. Serlio's source for much of his material was Baldassare Peruzzi who worked under Bramante at Saint Peter's and the Vatican Court.

⁴⁴For example, Venturi, Storia. Architettura del Cinquecento, XI, 1, pp. 62-68, esp. pp. 67-8; R. Bonelli, Da Bramante a Michelangelo (Venice, 1960), p. 19; G. de Angelis d'Ossat, 'Preludio romano del Bramante', Palladio, n.s. XVI (1966), 1-4, p. 85.

⁴⁵Bruschi, Bramante pp. 74, 78, 84.

⁴⁶Marconi, 'Il chiostro della Pace', pp. 427-8, 432-3. All that remains are the coat of arms of the north, south and west side of the upper arcade.

⁴⁷In the dedication, Vida, Epicedion, fol. 1^r, refers to Carafa's architectural patronage and its elegant results: 'non modo ne nostrae Paci aeternae dicatae aedes: quas ipse magnis sumptibus nobis elegantur construxit'. Within the poem itself (fol. 2^v), Vida states: 'Pacis structa domus nostrae testatur & almae/ Pallados innumeris tectum sublime columnis'.

⁴⁸It appears from the inventory of some 133 books compiled in 1484 that the Canons brought a library with them to Santa Maria della Pace. This manuscript is now in the Archivio Canonici Regolari Lateranensi di S. Pietro in Vincoli, fondo S. Maria della Pace (231 P. 184) and is published in Frutaz, 'Inventarium librorum monasterii Pacis', pp. 508-14.

⁴⁹Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 295-6, refers to a library, vigna and organ being given to the convent and church by Carafa. R. Lanciani, Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità (Rome, 1902), I, p. 106, states that Carafa bequeathed his collection of antiques to Santa Maria della Pace. Ricci, 'Il chiostro della Pace', p. 363, refers to the organ, vigna and tapestries. Since the contract for the organ of Santa Maria della Pace (published in T. Valenti, 'Il contratto per l'organo di Santa Maria della Pace in Roma', Note d'archivio per la storia musicale, IV (1927), pp. 129-202) names the Neapolitan architect and organ-maker, Giovanni Donadio, 'il Mormanno', as the contracted party, it seems plausible that Cardinal Carafa had a hand in this acquisition for the church. For Mormanno's reputation as an organ-maker, see R. Lunelli, L'arte organaria del Rinascimento in Roma (Florence, 1958), p. 4.

⁵⁰Vasari-Milanesi, cited above, note 5.

⁵¹As noted above, chapter 4, p. 189 and note 74, Carafa (in terms of his commission for a chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva and his support of Torquemada's confraternity of the Annunziata), appears to be following the range and style of Torquemada's patronage. Torquemada

also provided money c. 1450 for new vaulting in the church. See Urban, 'Des Kirchenbaukunst in Rom', pp. 119-124.

⁵²Leandro Alberti, De viris illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum, Bk. 3, p. 83: 'Sicqu[e]l primum aedium impluviu[m] praelibati Templi (quod claustrum vocant) a fundamentis erexit, et exornavit picturis, quibus meditationes praecipuas utriusqu[e] instrumenti, graphice inscriptas, ut facilius picturae dignosci valeant iussit apponi'.

⁵³Johannes de Turrecremata, Meditationes (Rome, 1467), printed by Ulrich Hahn. The edition used is the British Library copy (IB 17293). For the Meditationes and their relationship to the cloister, see L. de Gregori, Del chiostro della Minerva e del primo libro con figure stampato in Italia (Florence, 1927). The frescoes have been attributed to Fra Angelico by S. Orlandi, Beato Angelico (Florence, 1964), pp. 129-143.; to Melozzo da Forlì by Schmarsow, Melozzo da Forlì, p. 57-8; and to Antoniazio Romano by Berthier, L'église de la Minerve, p. 10. Thus the dating varies between the 1440s and 1460s.

⁵⁴A. Zucchi, 'L'antico convento della Minerva e le trasformazioni dei secoli XVI-XVII, Memorie Domenicane, XLIII, n.s. 1-3 (1967), pp. 144-162, esp. pp. 151-3.

⁵⁵Modesto Biliotti O.P., Venerabilis coenobii Sanctae Mariae Novellae de Florentia chronica in Analecta sacri ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum, Vol. IX (1909-10), p. 125: 'sed redeo ad eius patrum Oliverium, qui ex aede ingressus coenobium, secundum claustrum cum supraposito aedificavit solarium, et non paucas mansiones ibi et in inferiori dormitorio pro fratrum commoditate aedificavit'. AGOP, Ambrogio Brandi O.P., Cronaca del convento della Minerva (1610): 'Il chiostro più intimo, detto della Cisterna, fu restaurato e rifatto dal Card. Oliviero Caraffa, gran benefattore di questo convento. [annotation, dated 1706.] Il chiostro della Cisterna è quello un'ala del quale venne occupata dal refettorio, l'altra dalla cucina, la terza dal refettorio dei deboli, la quarta dal passo ai detti luoghi et altre officine'. Brandi's entry and its annotation is published in L. Respighi, 'Il chiostro domenicano della Cisterna alla Minerva in Roma', Bollettino d'arte, n.s. III, 2 (1923), pp. 23-7, esp. p. 27.

⁵⁶Illustrated in Frutaz, Le piante di Roma, no. CXLVII, tav. 315; no. CLVIII, tav. 362.

⁵⁷Respighi, 'Il chiostro della Cisterna', pp. 28-35.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 31.

⁵⁹Tomei, L'architettura a Roma, pp. 166-7, Figs. 110-112.

⁶⁰Respighi, 'Il chiostro della Cisterna', pp. 30-35; Zucchi, 'L'antico convento della Minerva', pp. 149-53.

⁶¹Sanudo, I diarii, p. 733, who gives the annual income of the benefice as 3000 ducats.

⁶²R. Guglielmi (ed.), La basilica di S. Lorenzo al Verano (Tesori d'arte cristiana) (Bologna, 1966), Vol. VII, p. 173.

⁶³Albertini, Opusculum de mirabilibus Romae, Bk. III, fol. 82r: 'Ecclesia S. Laurentii extra muros quam super Reverendissimus Oliverius Carrapha Card[inalis] Neapolitan[us] exornavit et laquearia aurea variis picturis adornata restituit'. Fra Mariano da Firenze, Itinerarium urbis Romae (1518), ed. E. Bulletti (Rome, 1931), p. 185: 'Novissime Oliverius Carapha Neapolitanus Cardinalis exornavit et laquearia aurea variis picturis adornata restituit'. This gift of a painted and gilded ceiling for San Lorenzo fuori le Mura is also referred to in a number of seventeenth and eighteenth-century descriptions of the city's churches.

⁶⁴A. Muñoz, La basilica di S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura (Rome, 1944), p. 13.

⁶⁵For the complex building history of this basilica which is an amalgamation of a fifth-century church built during the reign of Pelagius II (579-590), now the chancel and crypt, and a thirteenth-century church constructed by Honorius III (1216-27), now the nave and aisles, see Krautheimer, S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, *passim*.

⁶⁶See above, chapter 4, pp. 180, 239; chapter 5, pp. 298, 305.

⁶⁷Krautheimer, S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, pp. 14-15.

⁶⁸BAV, MSS Chigiani, I, V, 167, 'Inscriptiones et epitaphia', fol. 379r: 'In S. Laure[n]t[i]o extra muros in laquearib[us] literis aureis Oliveri[us] Carrapha episcop[us] Sabin[ensis] Card[inalis] Neapolitan[us] pie faciundum curavit anno salutis Christian[ae] MCCCCLXXXII memoriae in Christor[um] martyrii laurentii et stephani quor[um] corpora in hoc sarcophago resurrectione expectant'. The inscription also appears in Forcella, Iscrizioni, XII, p. 514, no. 575, who cites the Chigi manuscript as his source.

⁶⁹Cited by Krautheimer, S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, p. 15: 'Nel muro sopra nel mezzo è depinta la Madonna a destra S. Lorenzo a sinistra S. Stefano. In cima in mezzo vi è l'arma del card. Caraffa'.

⁷⁰'Testamento', fol. [2r]: 'Item relinquo fratrib[us] religiosis ord[inis] minor[um] de observancia nuncupatorum in araceli commorantibus p[ro] missis et oracionibus predictis...duc[atos] XV [in margin] similes'. Muntz, Les arts à la cour des papes (1878), Vol. II, pp. 87-8. R. Malmstrom, 'Santa Maria in Aracoeli at Rome' (PhD. dissertation, New York University, 1973), pp. 107-110. Seventeenth and eighteenth-century descriptions of the church refer to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's restoration (e.g. Franzini, Descrizione di Roma p. 293, Roiseco, Roma antica e moderna, I, p. 321).

⁷¹'Testamento', fol. [2v]: 'Item relinquo monasterio Santi Eusebii o[r]dinis celestinor[um] de Urbe duc[atos] ducentos p[ro] repler[ac]ione ip[sius] ecc[lesie] ... d[uc] CC'.

⁷²P. Ugonio, Historia delle stationi di Roma (Rome, 1588), fol. 260v: 'Si vede per l'armi della famiglia, questa chiesa essere stata ristaurata da un Cardinale dell'illustrissima casa Carafa'. See also above, chapter 2, p. 28, chapter 3, p. 115.

⁷³Chioccarello, Antistitum, pp. 304-5.

⁷⁴As stated above, p. 344, Carafa may have bequeathed a vigna outside the Porta di S. Maria del Popolo to the Canons Regular at Santa Maria della Pace. In a letter written by Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena in 1511, Bibbiena refers to the vigna at Tivoli that Cardinal Luigi of Aragon [1474-1519] had acquired from Cardinal Pietro Isvalies [d. 1511] who in turn had acquired it from Cardinal Oliviero Carafa. See Epistolario, ed. G. Montecallero (Florence, 1955), I, no. XC, p. 271. Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX, cites amongst the documents of the family archive of the Carafa d'Andria (no. 105) the Atto di notar Giovanni de Bekta (5 Feb., 1502) which records Carafa's purchase of: 'una casa con vigna ... nel luogo a li poczi lungo la via che menava a Porta Salaria'. From other notarial acts, dated 28 July, 1502, and 3 Mar., 1505 (Pergamene nos. 98, 114), which refer to the purchase of property in this vicinity, it appears that Carafa subsequently extended this vigna to a more sizeable holding.

⁷⁵Pergamene no. 289-11-123; Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 157, n.41.

⁷⁶See the incipit from Brenta's Hippocrates [c.1482-3] quoted above, chapter 3, note 65.

⁷⁷Raphaelis Lippi Brandolini, 'Operii index' (compiled for Balduino del Monte, brother to Julius III), BAV, Vat. lat. 3590, fol. 37v: 'In eo licet de vera nobilitate universi disputet: in primis tamen Oliverii Caraphae Card. laudi, generisque claritati studet; cuius etiam Quirinalem villam elegantissime describat'. In this index are also listed a letter and encomium to Carafa (fol.25v), a funerary and another oration to Alessandro Carafa (fols. 35r, 36r), and an oration to Saint Thomas Aquinas (fol.35v), see above, chapter 3, note 31. For Raffaele Lippi Brandolino, see G. Ballistreri's entry in the DBI, XIV (1972), pp. 40-2, esp. p. 41.

⁷⁸Lorenzi, Il carteggio, p. 94.

⁷⁹See E. Bigi's entry for 'Ermolao Barbaro', DBI, VI (1964), pp. 96-99.

⁸⁰Quoted in A. Luzio, 'Federico Gonzaga ostaggio alla corte di Giulio II', Archivio della Reale Società Romana di storia patria, IX (1886), p. 540: 'Mons l'Arcivescovo di Napoli dui di fa menò Sr. Fed. a una sua vigna a Monte Cavallo qual è bellissima stantia et bello giardino, et li dette disinar e zena, et tuto quello giorno stete li in grandissimo suo apiacer con una bella compagnia. El frate Mariano vi era che com li soi caprizi fece rider assai. [Another agent] Stette tutto il dì in gran piacer di soni et canti et giochi, poi cenò et frate Mariano de compagnia, qual fece qualche piacevoleza per far ridere

benchè mal possa scherzare perchè è mal sano'. The date of this visit has given rise to some confusion. D. Coffin, The villa in the life of Renaissance Rome (Princeton, 1979), p. 188, gives the date as 1512, but assumes incorrectly that Carafa was the young prince's host and that Carafa died in 1515. Geiger, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel, p. 42, n.79, is also incorrect in her assertion that the visit must have taken place in 1510 before Carafa's death in 1511. The agent's account clearly refers to Federigo's host as the Archbishop of Naples, a title never given to Carafa after becoming cardinal. Coffin's date for the visit is probably correct but Federigo's host must have been Vincenzo Carafa, Archbishop of Naples.

⁸¹Albertini, Opusculum de mirabilibus Romae, fol.87 r/v: 'Domus reverendissimol Olivarii Carraphae in Quirinali solati gratia constructa est ab eodem Reverendissimol Oliverio cardinalis Neapolitanol cum vinea & hortulo & aliis locis multis picturis & epithafel exornatis cum epigram[is] multis'. Fra Mariano, Itinerarium urbis, p.208: 'Ille mons a dextris habens domum Reverendissimol Oliverii Caraphae cardinalis Neapolitani, pars est montis Quirinalis qui vocatur mons Clatere et Apollonis, Palatium illud cum viridario, multis picturis et marmoreis statu[s] ornatum, idem cardinalis fundavit'.

⁸²Coffin, The villa in Renaissance Rome, pp.187-8.

⁸³Pray Bober and Rubinstein, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture, cat. nos. 65, 125, pp.101-2, 159-61. Apart from being called Monte Cavallo, the Quirinal was frequently confused with the Esquiline.

⁸⁴Chambers, 'The housing problems of Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga', pp. 32-3; Coffin, The villa in Renaissance Rome, pp.187-8.

⁸⁵From a contract drawn up on 25 April, 1545, by the notary, Melchiorre Valeri (Vol.767, Archivio segreto Capitolino, cited by Lanciani, Storia degli scavi, IV, p. 93) one learns that the property was leased to Cardinal Orazio Farnese for the sum of 500 scudi per annum. As early as 1536, Fichard in his description of the city had referred to the vigna Farnesiorum on the Quirinal.

⁸⁶Archivio di Stato, Protocolli 5529, fols. 19-20, Atti di Notar Pechinolo (cited in part by Lanciani, Storia degli scavi, IV, p. 94): 'iuxta suos fines, qui ab antiquo erant, prout in instrumento donationis eorundem locorum et iurium per R.mum bo. me. Oliverium Carraffam episcopum Sabinensem S.R.E. cardinalem tunc Neapolitanum nuncupatum R. do. bo. me. in Christo patri dno. Alexandro Carraffe e Ill.mo d. Nestori etiam Carraffe fratribus suis facte sub die 24 mensis Augusti [sic] anni 1502 plenius descripti sunt ... vinea quae vulgo dicitur seu dicebatur la vigna di Nappoli una cum viridario et duobus palatiis, intus et in lateribus dicte vinee positis, omnibusque aliis eiusdem vinee domibus, edificiis, hortis, hortaliis et aliis membris'.

⁸⁷For the most detailed study of the Quirinal palace to date, see J.Wasserman, 'The Quirinal Palace in Rome', Art Bulletin, XC (1963), pp. 205-44, who provides an extensive bibliography on the palace and its history.

⁸⁸See Frutaz, Le piante di Roma, no. CIX, tav. 197; no. CXXVII, tav. 240.

⁸⁹C. Hülsen, Römische Antikengärten des XVI. Jahrhunderts (Heidelberg, 1917), pp. 85-6.

⁹⁰Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no.49-92-8. See also Wasserman, 'The Quirinal Palace', pp. 207-10.

⁹¹Alberti, Ten books on architecture, Bk. IX, ch. 2, p. 189.

⁹²The mural is situated on the long rear wall of the Salotto, to the right of the door leading to the back corridor of the ground floor of the Villa d'Este at Tivoli. According to D. Coffin, The Villa d'Este at Tivoli (Princeton, New Jersey, 1960), p. 53, the mural paintings were probably executed c.1568 by Matteo Neroni of Siena. See *ibid.*, fig. 53 for an illustration of the rear wall and Wasserman, 'The Quirinal Palace', fig.6, for an illustration of the detail showing the Quirinal villa.

⁹³In the sixteenth-century plan of the property (my Fig. 7), a number of other constructions feature. Wasserman identifies the octagonal structure on the north side of the garden as a garden edifice documented as being put up in 1561, and the south building bordering on the Via Pia as one either built by Carafa's heirs or by Orazio Farnese. While his suggestion is perfectly plausible, it should be noted that Alessandro predeceased Oliviero by some eight years and that Vincenzo Carafa probably assumed ownership of the villa after Carafa's death. See above, note 80.

⁹⁴In 1987, this building was not accessible due to extensive restoration and the author was only able to photograph the exterior. For description and analysis of the building, see Tomei, L'architettura a Roma, pp. 92-5, Pls. 50-1; Coffin, The villa in Renaissance Rome, pp. 64-66, Pls. 30-32.

⁹⁵Hülsen, Römische Antikengärten, pp. 85-6; Coffin, *ibid.*, pp. 187-9.

⁹⁶Jacobus Mazochius, Epigrammata antiquae urbis (Rome, 1521), fol. XLIIr: 'Monte in colle Quirinale ... Ibidem in Domo Archiepiscopi Neapolitani, D.M./ SALFEIA ATHENAIDI QUAE VIX. ANNIS. XV. MENS. VIIII. DIE/ XXVIII. FECIT ARRIVUS CRESCES CON QVA VIX. ANN[OI] VNO MEN/SES. VIII. Ibidem propr portam. P.VALERIVS BASSVS PRAEFECTVS FABRVM ET CAECILIA PROCNE/ DIANA VALERIANAE D.D.'

⁹⁷Schrader, Monumentorum Italiae, p. 218, under 'Inscriptiones hortorum et villarum: in villa Archiepiscopi Neapolitani'. Typical examples of the style of epigram recorded by Schrader are: 'In primis venerare deos, atq[ue]l annua magnae sacra refer Cereri' (Vergil, Georgics, I, 338-9); 'Opera non impensa cultura constet [sic]' (Pliny the Elder, Natural history, XVIII, 8, 43).

⁹⁸See above, chapter 3, pp. 117, 128.

⁹⁹Cortesium, De cardinalitu, Liber I, cap. II, fol. 14^v: 'Oliverius quidem Carrapha ... a rosae odore tanq[ui]a tabifico nocenteq[ue] quodam moribido refugit'; Giovanni Pietro Valeriano, Hieroglyphica (Basle, 1575), fol. 61^v: 'Nam cum Romae essem, vidi Oliverium Caraffam magnae celebritatis Cardinalem, qui rosarum tempore quotannis fecedere cogebatur, fecit intra suos, quos in Quirinali habebat, hortos claudere, custodiis ad ostia dispositis, ne quis aut salutantum, aut amicorum officii gratia ingredientium rosam inferret'.

¹⁰⁰Schrader, Monumentorum Romae, p. 218: 'Villam perpetuae salubritatis / Suburbi modo montis Esquilini, / Oliverius ille cardinalis, / Doctae clara Neapolis propago / Hanc Caraffa suis amicis / Dicat omnibus, hospites venite'.

¹⁰¹D. Coffin, 'The "Lex hortorum" and access to gardens of Latium during the Renaissance', Journal of garden history, II, 3 (1982), pp. 201-232.

¹⁰²Burchard, Liber notarum, 1, p. 271. See also *ibid.*, 2, p. 450. He also refers to the palace as Carafa's usual residence.

¹⁰³Crossing the Tiber by the Ponte Sant'Angelo, the Via Papale followed the Canale di Ponte (now the Via del Banco di Santo Spirito). At its southern end, it took the present Via dei Banchi Nuovi and Via del Governo Vecchio past the then palace of Cardinal Stefano Nardini (now the Palazzo del Governo Vecchio). The palace of the Cardinal of Naples stood at a juncture point of several streets. The processional route passed directly past its entrance facade on the present Via di San Pantaleo and then proceeded towards the Largo Argentina by a street running along the modern Corso Emmanuele. From there it followed the Via delle Botteghe Oscure past the basilica of San Marco and across the Forum. It then passed under the Arch of Titus, around the Colosseum and up the Via Major (Via di San Giovanni in Laterano) to the Lateran.

¹⁰⁴See above, chapter 3, p. 131.

¹⁰⁵For the history of the Palazzo Orsini, see C. Pietrangeli, 'Storia del Palazzo: Palazzo Orsini a Pasquino e Palazzo Braschi', in Palazzo Braschi e il suo ambiente, eds. C. Pietrangeli and A. Ravaglioli (Rome, 1967), pp. 33-56. See also Magnuson, Studies in architecture, pp. 241-3.

¹⁰⁶Rome, Archivio di Stato, Mappe collezioni, I, c. 87, no. 565 (this plan has extensive annotations on it, relating to the block of shops and their measurements); no. 567 (dated Marzo 8, 1721).

¹⁰⁷Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emmanuele II, MS Fondo Vitt. Em. 721, fol. 71^v: 'Casa a Pasquino del Sig. r Antonio Orsino ha facciata dinanti di passi 56 quella del fianco di passi 84 è bassa, che ha un fenestrato sotto all'antica la Porta non e nel mezzo ha gran cortile che non ha se non un poco di loggia à man dritta, dentro è molto commoda per il Padrone'.

¹⁰²Cited by Tomei, L'architettura a Roma, p. 36: 'FRANCISCI DE URSINIS URBIS PRAEFECT. FILIORUMQUE'. For Francesco Orsini, see Litta, Famiglie celebri di Italia, V (1847), 'Orsini di Roma', tav. XXII. Francesco, his sons and grandsons, had numerous connections with Naples and feudal holdings in Carafa's bishopric of Sabina.

¹⁰³According to P. Adinolfi, La via sacra o del Papa tra 'l cerchio d'Antonio ed il teatro di Pompeo (Rome, 1865), p. 23: 'e nell'alto due piani, l'inferiore delli quali conteneva una sala con otto stanze annoverando camere ed anticamere, la qual sala non era messa in quadro, ma piegando era più stretta in una testa che nell'altra, ed in questo piano era eziandio la galleria e la cappella con altre quattro stanze partitamente abitabili. Nel sopra stante piano dopo altrettante stanze corrispondenti alle otto del primo piano, altre ve ne avea su quelle quattro e posanti in falso, e sopra queste ultime v'eran delli stanzini per uso de'famigliari e delle fanti con contigua guardarobia. Oltre ciò pe'famigliari eranvi sei stanzette sopra la galleria, e sotto di essa la stalla'. Adinolfi gives no source for this description of the palace and its layout, and none of the details correspond to the two plans in the Archivio di Stato.

¹¹⁰These are two engravings by Giovanni Vasi and a painting (Galleria Nazionale d'Arte antica) by Sinnibaldo Scorza. See Pietrangeli, 'Palazzo Orsini a Pasquino', Pls. V, VII.

¹¹¹See ibid., Pl. III and Frutaz, Le piante di Roma, no. CXXVII, tav. 244 (Du Pérac, 1577); no. CXLVII, tav. 315 (Maggi, 1625, reprint, Losi, 1774); no. CLVIII, tav. 362 (Falda, 1676).

¹¹²Illustrated in Pietrangeli, 'Palazzo Orsini a Pasquino', Pl. IV.

¹¹³Vasari-Milanesi, V, pp. 452-3: 'Essendo in questo tempo in Roma Antonio di Monte, cardinale di Santa Prassedia, volle che il medesimo gli facesse il palazzo, dove poi abitò, che risponde in Agone, dove è la statua di maestro Pasquino: nel mezzo risponde nella piazza, dove fabbricò una torre; la quale, con bellissimo componimento di pilastri e fenestre dal primo ordine fino al terzo, con grazie e con disegno gli fu da Antonio ordinata e finata, e per Francesco dell'Indaco lavorata di terretta a figure e storie dalla banda di dentro a di fuori'.

¹¹⁴See above, note 31.

¹¹⁵Cortese's chapter on the palace for a cardinal has been translated and analysed in K. Weil-Garris and J.F. d'Amico, The Renaissance cardinal's ideal palace: a chapter from Cortesi's 'De cardinalatu' (Cambridge, Mass., 1980). All references to this part of De cardinalatu will hereafter be to this edition.

¹¹⁶Ibid., pp. 70, 71.

¹¹⁷See above, chapter 3, pp. 116-7, 121; Cortese, ibid., pp. 72, 73.

¹¹⁸Mappe no. 565: 'camera de palanfrinerii ... sotto e sopra'. On the verso of no. 567, amongst written details of the topographical

layout of the area are two references to 'Stalla Orsini'. See also Cortese ibid., pp. 76, 77, 78, 79.

¹¹⁹Ibid., pp. 78, 79, 80, 81.

¹²⁰De Maio, Savonarola, p. 25, n.2.

¹²¹Cortese, 'The Renaissance cardinal's ideal palace', pp. 80, 81.

¹²²Ibid., pp. 80, 81, 82, 84, 83, 85.

¹²³See above, chapter 4, p. 178: 'Filippo di Filippo dipintore con Mons:^{re} Rev:^{mo} di Napoli in Rome'.

¹²⁴Cortese, The Renaissance cardinal's ideal palace, pp. 92, 93; see also above, chapter 4, p. 170.

¹²⁵It appears from the documents cited by Scandone, 'I Carafa di Napoli', as in the family archive of the Carafa d'Andria that Carafa also purchased other property in Rome. It is not clear, however, from these records of purchase whether these properties were intended for his own use or merely as a form of income. They do confirm, however, the overall impression of Carafa as a person of some considerable wealth continually extending and reviewing his assets.

CHAPTER VII

Other projects in Naples

While Cardinal Carafa as a royal councillor would have been aware of the magnificent series of architectural projects inaugurated by the fifteenth-century Aragonese royal family and would have had access to their magnificent library and to their art collection, his record of artistic patronage in his home town was perforce more modest.¹ Despite his wealth he had not the extensive financial and administrative resources of the royal household, nor would it have been judicious for him in his early career as Archbishop and loyal servant to Ferrante to have flaunted too boldly his position as a wealthy and powerful ecclesiastic. Moreover, once a cardinal he rarely visited his home town and thus removed from the city had less incentive to contribute to its fabric. The most impressive testimony to his patriotic feelings towards Naples lies in the chapel of the Succorpo which, as has been argued in chapter five, constituted a bold statement of Carafa's status in the city at that particular time and his relative autonomy.² Elsewhere, he concentrated his efforts on a number of projects either of a more private nature concerning his own family, or more public, benefitting the city at large.

Carafa palaces and the Carafa chapel in San Domenico Maggiore

The Carafa family enclave lay at the heart of the city in the Seggio di Nido, one of the five wards of the city. The ~~seggi~~ seggi, so called because

of the special room or seggio where local notables met to administer the affairs of their district, were originally associations of persons living around a certain square or in a certain street. The Seggio di Nido, for example, was originally a consorteria of nobles whose palaces lined the street of the Nido. Originally the seggi had numbered more than five, but under the Angevins the wealthier and more powerful associations had absorbed the less powerful. The Seggio di Nido was the proudest and most exclusive of all, with the ties between its members very close and often further strengthened by intermarriage.³

Within this district were situated a number of Carafa palaces (some of which survive today, albeit in a much altered state⁴) thus providing physical testimony of the tightknit network of territorial association typical of Italian Renaissance familial patterns.⁵

The principal church and priory of the Dominican Order in Naples - San Domenico Maggiore - also lay within the Seggio di Nido and it was this church that the Carafa family chose as their place of worship and burial, endowing several funerary chapels within the church and enlarging the adjacent priory.⁶

Oliviero Carafa had the example of both his father and uncle to demonstrate the kinds of artistic patronage with which he might become involved. On the testimony of his seventeenth-century biographer, Aldimari, it appears that Francesco Carafa acted as a patron of architecture in the most traditional sense, purchasing property near the church of SS Severino e Sossò in order to build a family palace,

constructing a villa at Portici (one of his feudal holdings) and restoring the Franciscan priory there, where he ultimately retired to die.⁷ His architectural patronage had therefore something of the style of that of Cosimo il Vecchio, with its emphasis on functional needs be they practical or spiritual.⁸ In Diomede, however, Oliviero had a model who was both more ambitious and imaginative in the scope of his artistic patronage.

Diomede's palace, known both as the Palazzo Maddaloni and Sant'Angelo, stands on the Via di San Biagio dei Librai in a somewhat dilapidated state but still representing an illuminating example of fifteenth-century Renaissance Neapolitan architecture. The entrance facade faced in ashlar blocks with deep-cut joints is typical of a number of mid-to late fifteenth-century palaces in Naples - indicative of a taste for the decorative texture of such rustication.⁹ The entrance portal is made more imposing by a somewhat unorthodox entablature which carries for its architrave a festoon of tightly scrolled laurel leaves supported by corbels. Between it and the cornice is a frieze which bears the carved insignia of the Carafa coat of arms, the stadera and Diomede's personal impresa of a pegged-out hide. Over the cornice are two classical busts and a niche hollowed into the surface of the wall in which is housed a statue of Hercules. High on the facade at the level of the roofline is a frieze with an inscription which proclaims the owner's loyalty to Ferrante.¹⁰ Portrait busts of Diomede and his wife appear on each of the two street corners of the building.

Beyond the original wooden doors carved with heraldic family devices is an internal courtyard with a single ground floor loggia on one side. The architectural style of the basket arch of the androne and of the loggia, with its Gothic piers supporting segmental Catalan vaults, is characteristic of late fourteenth-century and early fifteenth-century south Italian architecture. However, the single fluted Corinthian column which carries the vaulted bay to the immediate left of the androne is much more classical in appearance and therefore closer in style to the facade architecture. The base of the column carries an inscription identifying Diomedes as the founder of the building and dedicating it to king and country.' As indicated by the facade inscription, the building was complete by 1466 and subsequently, in 1473 and 1475, Diomedes entertained foreign dignitaries there.¹² Overall the style of the palace architecture suggests that it was originally an earlier building adapted to its owner's taste for the latest style in Renaissance architecture. The architect is not known.¹³

Pietro Summonte in his description to Marcantonio Michiel of the delights of Naples pays tribute to Diomedes's collection of sculpture housed within the palace:

In questa città, in casa del signor conte di Matalone, di man di Donatello, è quel bellissimo cavallo in forma di colosso, cioè la testa col collo di bronzo. Sono nella medesima casa molte opere marmoree antiche di varie e diverse specie e in bona quantità.¹⁴

The quantity of antiques described by Summonte in Diomedes's palace receives further confirmation in a number of seventeenth-century accounts which refer to the palace's extensive collection and display of antique pieces.¹⁵ The horsehead in bronze, now in the Museo Nazionale in Naples, attributed erroneously by Antonio Billi to Donatello, is now deemed to be a late Hellenistic Greek work of the third century B.C. Vasari in his life of Donatello repeats Billi's misattribution and reports that 'in casa del conte di Matalone, nella città medesima, e una testa di cavallo di mano di Donato tanto bella, che molti la credono antica'. A letter amongst the Medici's private papers and written on 12 July, 1471, to Lorenzo de' Medici by Diomedes, thanks him for the gift of a horse's head in bronze. Since the horsehead in Naples corresponds closely to the one in the Museo Archeologico in Florence which was confiscated in 1495 from the Medici palace where it served as a fountain, it now seems that Donatello, rather than being the author of the bronze horsehead, received inspiration from it for his equestrian statue of the Gattamelata. A terracotta copy of the horsehead now stands in the courtyard of the Palazzo Maddaloni.¹⁶

Oliviero Carafa may also have wished to emulate Diomedes's patronage of letters. As noted in chapter two, Diomedes was an author of a number of humanist works, albeit of a practical kind, be they rhetorical pieces on the style of deportment for members of the Aragonese royal family or advice on military and administrative affairs. Tammaro de Marinis in his magisterial work on the royal library also found evidence in the Neapolitan archives of Diomedes authorising payments in connection with the preparation of books for the library. Two handsomely produced

manuscript copies of Diomede's own work survive to give proof of his abilities in this direction. The first, a copy of his de regimine principum, now in the Hermitage, Leningrad, is a de-luxe edition, executed in gold and silver on purple dyed parchment by the famous Neapolitan scribe, Giovanni Marco Cinico. The other, a copy of de institutione vivendi ad Beatricem Aragoniam Pannoniae Reginam, again copied by Cinico and now in the Biblioteca Palatina, Parma, is, if anything, more resplendent, with gold letters on alternating leaves of purple and green parchment and miniatures by Cola Rapranicano.¹⁷ Finally, a portrait medal in the British Museum (possibly an early work by the celebrated Neapolitan medallist, Candida), acts as the sole survivor of this remarkable patron's collection of contemporary art.¹⁸

While Oliviero Carafa followed in his uncle's footsteps by building a private residence in Rome, amassing a collection of antique art within its walls and supporting humanist studies in a number of different ways, his patronage of family monuments within Naples itself was expressed primarily in the embellishment of the family chapel in San Domenico Maggiore. As regards his father's palace, Aldimari identifies a great part of it as being built by Oliviero Carafa, and states that in the author's lifetime it was in the possession of Carafa's descendent, the Duke d'Andria. The present Palazzo Carafa d'Andria on the corner of the Largo San Marcellino and the Vicolo SS Severino e Sosso, and therefore in the close vicinity of the church of SS Severino e Sosso and Diomede's palace, has been subject to a great deal of alteration over the centuries - as seen by its neo-classical entrance facade which undoubtedly covers architecture of an earlier period. Due to its

present conversion into a technical college for women, the building is virtually impossible to examine in any detail. However, there are traces of Catalan Gothic ornament on the facade facing onto the Vicolo di SS Severino e Sossio, which suggests that the building could date from Francesco's lifetime or possibly earlier. Despite the fact that the ground floor loggie have been filled in in order to provide the college with extra corridors, it is still possible to get some sense of what must have once been a fine internal courtyard and entrance androne. From what survives of the courtyard's architecture, it would appear to be mid-to-late fifteenth-century in date. Nothing remains of the spacious garden described in the seventeenth century by Celano. In the absence of any historical information, other than a number of brief references by seventeenth-century writers, it can only be a matter of speculation what, if any, of the palace can be attributed to Oliviero Carafa's personal intervention.¹³

The church of San Domenico Maggiore erected between 1289 and 1324 and incorporating an earlier church, Sant'Angelo a Morfisa, once represented a characteristic example of an Italian Gothic Dominican church, but now, due to structural damage from successive earthquakes and various campaigns of renovation, retains little of its original appearance.²⁰ By the mid-fifteenth century it had already benefitted from the patronage of the Carafa family with the endowment of a funerary chapel for Carafa's grandfather, Antonio 'Malizia' Carafa, in the second chapel in the north aisle of the church. His tomb monument, attributed to the Lombard sculptor, Jacopo della Pila, presents a conventional format (Pl. 148). The deceased, arrayed in armour to signify his military career,

lies on a bier beneath a canopy. Two angels gently lift the curtains on either side of his final resting place. Below, a fourteenth-century sarcophagus depicting the Madonna and Christ Child with Saints Catherine and Mary Magdalen has been incorporated into this mid-fifteenth-century tomb monument. Statues of Fortitude, Temperance and Prudence act as caryatid supports. The tomb as a whole is enclosed in an architectonic framework which is classical in style and embellished with the Carafa coat of arms, the stadera and inscriptions alluding to the deceased and his achievements. As noted by a number of scholars, the similarity in design to Donatello and Michelozzo's tomb for Cardinal Rinaldo Brancaccio in the nearby church of Sant'Angelo a Nilo is striking.²¹

Oliviero Carafa's personal contribution to the fabric of San Domenico was focussed not on his grandfather's chapel but on another larger rectangular chapel that lies at right angles to the south aisle and parallel to the south transept. This chapel is known as the Cappellone del Crocifisso since the thirteenth-century panel of the Crucifixion, which is reputed to have spoken to Saint Thomas Aquinas, is housed on its altar. This image of Christ crucified accompanied by the Virgin Mary and Saint John the Evangelist and two tiny Dominicans who kneel in adoration at the foot of the Cross still today attracts a great deal of religious devotion and the miracle with which it is associated is depicted on the seventeenth-century altar frontal below it. The date of the painting's placement on the altar of the Carafa chapel is, however, a matter of debate. Originally in the chapel of Saint Nicholas of Bari in the ancient church of Sant'Angelo a Morfisa, where the miracle was said to have taken place, it appears to have been removed to the Carafa

chapel by 1560 at the latest and become a focus for veneration. As pointed out in chapter four, there is therefore no secure evidence that Carafa chose the subject of the miracle of the Crucifix for the upper lunette mural of his Roman chapel (if indeed this is what that painting is about) because his family then had that revered object in their chapel.²² Nevertheless, the association of San Domenico Maggiore and its priory with the saint was indubitably a crucial factor for Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's choice of dedicatee for the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva.

On either side of the altar housing the Crucifixion panel are two impressive tomb monuments. On the left, as one faces the altar, is the tomb of Francesco Carafa (d.1496) and on the right, the tomb of Diomede Carafa (d.1487). On Francesco's tomb (Pl. 149) an inscription clearly states that Oliviero Carafa acted as executor to his father and caused this tomb to be erected.²³ Inscribed on Diomede's tomb (Pl. 150) is his personal motto - fine in tanto and the date of 1470. Both monuments comprise the same basic components. At the base is the sediale - a marble bench characteristic of fifteenth-century Neapolitan tombs. On the back of the sediale on both tombs is the Carafa coat of arms framed by the stadera. Diomede's tomb has the added device of the pegged out hide. Above the entablature which crowns the sediale is the deceased lying on a very classical-looking sarcophagus. An epitaph advertises the particular virtues of the deceased.²⁴ Both men have been portrayed in armour with their feet resting upon a pair of very soulful looking dogs (Pls. 149-151). Above the second entablature is a lunette relief. On Francesco's tomb, Francesco appears as a votary arrayed in civilian

robes before the Madonna and Christ Child. Behind him, a portly Dominican acts as his saintly mentor. Another Dominican appears on the right (Pl. 149). The first Dominican could possibly represent Aquinas himself, while the other, with his attribute of a lily, can be more confidently identified as Saint Dominic, the titular saint of the church. The lunette on Diomedes's tomb depicts the Annunziata (Pl. 152). The iconography of these lunette reliefs thus provide a significant anticipation of the subject matter of the mural altarpiece in Carafa's own funerary chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (Pl. 17).

Both tomb monuments are framed by piers housing four niches in which are placed statues of saints and Virtues. On Francesco's tomb are Prudence (upper left), Saint John the Evangelist (upper right), Fortitude, in all'antica helmet and breastplate (lower left), and Saint Peter (lower right), (Pl. 149). On Diomedes's tomb are Justice (upper left), Temperance (upper right), Prudence (lower left), and Fortitude (lower right), (Pl. 150). Both monuments are surmounted by coffered arches, embellished with cherubim on their outer face.

On the grounds of similarity to the tomb of Mariano d'Alagno and his wife, Caterina Orsini, for which Tommaso Malvito was contracted on 7 November 1506, in the main body of the Cappellone del Crocifisso, Francesco's tomb has been attributed to that sculptor. However, due to its inscribed date of 1470, it has been suggested that Diomedes's tomb was executed by Jacopo della Pila and then remodelled by Tommaso Malvito.²⁵ Since both tombs share common features of design, it would appear that they were designed by the same sculptor (cf. Pls. 149, 150).

Given that both men would have left funds and precise instructions in their wills for their tomb monuments, it seems likely that at the time of Francesco's death in 1496, Oliviero Carafa, as nominal head of the Carafa clan, took steps to initiate the construction of his father's tomb and the revamping of his uncle's tomb, selecting Tommaso Malvito as the most competent sculptor to do so.

With the example of these impressive family monuments before them, other members of the Carafa family followed suit and chose burial sites in San Domenico.²⁶ One of Carafa's designated heirs, Ettore Carafa, Count of Ruvo, endowed a funerary chapel directly adjoining the Cappellone del Crocifisso. This chapel, attributed to Romolo Balsimelli and richly embellished with sculpted reliefs and frescoes in the cupola, contains the tombs of Ettore and his illegitimate son, Troilus. It also houses a wooden presepio commissioned on 4 August 1507 from one of Malvito's close associates, Pietro Belverte. Ettore Carafa also contributed to the fabric of the adjacent priory.²⁷ In the meantime, Oliviero Carafa had transferred his patronage to the cathedral, in order to build within it a funerary chapel for himself and his descendants. It appears, nevertheless, that in terms of certain iconographical themes Carafa's own funerary monuments, one in Rome and the other in Naples, derive some inspiration from the family tombs in San Domenico. While in terms of fifteenth-century tomb sculpture there is nothing particularly remarkable about the series of Carafa tombs in this Neapolitan church, they also provide a context of a consistent family tradition for the celebration of the worldly achievements and spiritual aspirations of the

male members of the Carafa family - a tradition to which Oliviero Carafa decisively contributed.

The Duomo and Archbishop's Palace

In his official capacity, first as Archbishop and then Cardinal of Naples, Carafa also contributed to the embellishment and upkeep of the city's cathedral. His most notable act of patronage was the construction and endowment of the Succorpo but he also commissioned other works for the cathedral and its precinct.

According to a number of seventeenth-century sources, Carafa was responsible for the restoration of the Archbishop's palace.²⁸ Although no physical remains of this restoration survive today, it is plausible that he would have attended to the palace's fabric.

Circumstantial evidence leads one to believe that Cardinal Carafa also commissioned a new altarpiece for the high altar of the cathedral which was then located in front of the chancel under the crossing.²⁹ Vasari, in his 1550 edition of the *Lives*, states in the biography of Perugino that the Umbrian painter, 'dipinse al Cardinal Caraffa di Napoli nello Piscopio una tavola allo altar maggiore dentrovi l'annunziatione [*sic*] di Nostra Donna, e gli apostoli ammirati intorno al sepulchro'. In the 1568 edition he corrects the title of the painting to the Assumption.³⁰ A large-scale painting of the Assumption of the Virgin by Perugino and assistants (Pl. 153) was indeed once located on the high altar of Naples

cathedral where it is described in the 1574 visitation report of Archbishop Mario Carafa.³¹ The subject of this painting is not, however, a straightforward representation of the Assumption as described by Vasari, since it does not depict the Virgin's tomb but includes instead a kneeling donor figure portrayed in an act of veneration before the Virgin Assunta. Saint Januarius appears as a sponsor beside him (Pl. 154).

Seventeenth-century sources describe this painting as on the high altar but disagree on the identity of the donor figure. D'Engenio and Sarnelli name him as Carafa's successor as Archbishop of Naples, Vincenzo Carafa. Celano identifies him as Oliviero Carafa.³² The facial features of the donor figure do not bear close comparison to those portraits of Oliviero Carafa by Filippino Lippi and Tommaso Malvito (cf. Pls. 38, 39, 96, 107, 154). Nevertheless, the figure is arrayed in cardinal's robes and since Vincenzo was not made a cardinal until 1527,³³ four years after Perugino's death, it must therefore be a portrait of Oliviero Carafa. Vincenzo's donation of a tabernacle for the high altar may account for D'Engenio's and Sarnelli's misidentification.³⁴ The poor condition of the paint surface does not exclude the possibility of the donor figure's features being repainted at some later date.³⁵

Critical opinion has long been divided on the degree of collaboration in this painting and its date of execution. From his knowledge of Carafa's ecclesiastical career, Strazzullo has made the valid assumption that the commission for the high altarpiece would have been the result

of Carafa's renewed interest in the fabric of the cathedral during his third term of office as Archbishop (1503-1505). More recently, Sylvia Ferino, on the basis of a drawing by Perugino in the Uffizi, has argued for a date of 1508-9. Since work on Cardinal Carafa's chapel project of the Succorpo may well have continued until 1508, this later dating is not incompatible with Carafa's continued involvement in the embellishment of Naples cathedral.³⁶

Although the appearance of the painting is such as to suggest a workshop piece, it is very similar in design and iconography to the lost mural executed by Perugino for the altar wall of the Sistine chapel. On the basis of the drawing of this mural altarpiece³⁷ a number of similarities between it and the Naples high altarpiece are immediately apparent. Both paintings are divided into two zones. In the upper zone appears the Assunta portrayed in a contrapposto pose and framed by a mandorla of cherubim. Two angels hold a crown above her head as a sign of her status as Queen of Heaven while others make music around her. In the lower zone appear the twelve apostles with Saint Paul located in the right-hand foreground. Saint Thomas with the Virgin's girdle over his arm is shown in an identical, if reversed, kneeling pose in the centre. On the left is a kneeling donor figure, under the benign protection of a patron saint (cf. Pls. 49, 153).

Despite the striking similarities in design, there are also a number of significant differences. In order to accommodate Saint Januarius in the Naples altarpiece, the apostles have had to be positioned more closely to one another. The Virgin Assunta also appears to be looking downwards

at Cardinal Carafa - a detail which also occurs on the frescoed altar wall of the Carafa chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (cf. Pls. 14, 42, 153). The angels appear as single studies of musician angels - culled one suspects from a workshop pattern book - and lack the livelier characterisation and compositional arrangement of the Sistine version. The landscape is rendered as a more expansive portrayal of the countryside viewed from a high viewpoint and is thus consonant with Perugino's later style of painting.

While the choice of a subject can be accounted for by the cathedral's dedication to the Assunta, the choice of Perugino to execute the high altarpiece is surely significant. Carafa would have been familiar with the mural altarpiece of the cappella papalis. He therefore employed the same painter to provide him with a near replica of the papal altarpiece in order to place it on the high altar of his cathedral. He also requested that in place of the pope's portrait, his own be introduced under the protective gesture of Naples' principal patron saint, Januarius. While Perugino's painting may not appear a very impressive piece today, it should be remembered that this painter's work was then much sought after³⁸ and at that time a copy did not necessarily have a diminished status, particularly if it reproduced another celebrated image. This painting, in its original guise as high altarpiece, would once have made a very conspicuous pictorial statement about Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, his status as cardinal of the Church, his devotion towards the Virgin Mary and his loyalty towards his home town of Naples.

The hospital at San Gennaro extra moenia

According to a number of seventeenth-century sources, Oliviero Carafa as Archbishop of Naples restored in 1468 the ruined fifth-century cemetery church of San Gennaro extra moenia and established in the adjacent Benedictine monastery a hospital for the indigent.³⁹ San Gennaro extra moenia, situated on the hillside of Capodimonte, was greatly revered as the location of the second-century catacombs where, it was reputed, Saint Januarius' remains were buried in the fifth century by Bishop Severus. The church and catacombs subsequently housed the relics of other of Naples' bishop saints.⁴⁰ The findings of an archaeological investigation undertaken in 1927 reveal that during the fifteenth-century the nave columns were replaced by piers, but two antique Corinthian columns framing the triumphal arch of the apse were retained.⁴¹ Thus as early as 1468 Oliviero Carafa was involved in a project of restoration which displayed an appreciation of an Early Christian building and its residual classical appearance. This particular sensibility was destined to reassert itself in a number of his later artistic projects - the most notable being his restoration of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura and the layout and embellishment of the Succorpo.

The hospital, which is still in use today, but totally rebuilt in the seventeenth century, was placed by Archbishop Oliviero Carafa under the administrative care of a lay confraternity composed of both the nobility and the populace. This arrangement did not work, so in 1474 Carafa created a new body comprising only the populace with members elected

every three years from the seggi of Capuana, Sellaria, San Giovanni a mare and Mercato. This arrangement was ratified by Paul II in a papal bull and confirmed by Sixtus IV in another bull dated 1 February 1474. The Archbishop of Naples was destined to retain an interest in this hospital foundation, since in this bull a specific clause entitles the Archbishop to an annual tribute from the hospital administration. In 1479, after an outbreak of plague, the hospital devoted itself to the care of plague victims.⁴²

The Sapienza

There is also good historical evidence that Cardinal Carafa inaugurated another civic foundation for the welfare of his fellow citizens. Sarnelli writes that in his time the convent of Santa Maria Sapienza functioned as a house for Dominican nuns, but it had been planned as a college for poor students who wished to acquire a good education. This project had been started in 1507 but never completed. The building was then sold and converted into a convent.⁴³ Sarnelli's account receives confirmation from other documentary sources. A notarial document drawn up at the instruction of one of Carafa's relatives, Tommaso Carafa, Count of Maddaloni, on 29 July 1511 (six months after his death) allocates the site of the Sapienza to Vincenzo Carafa, Archbishop of Naples, and his brothers, Giacomo and Antonio, Count of Ruvo (see Table I). Along with this property went supplies of dressed and undressed stone, lime, wood and other materials.⁴⁴ This property was subsequently sold by Vincenzo and Giacomo Carafa to Giovanni Pietro and Marino Stendardo and Giovanni Latro. The purchasers obtained a licence from

Leo X, dated 6 May 1519, to establish a convent of Clarisse nuns in that building. In 1528, the Imperial Spanish troops occupied the convent and the nuns took up residence in the convent of Santa Maria Donnaromita. Maria Carafa, sister to Giovanni Pietro Carafa, Archbishop of Chieti and thus a relative of Oliviero Carafa (see Table II) was encouraged by her brother to establish the Dominican Observant rule there. On 23 June, 1530, the newly reformed convent was established at Santa Maria Sapienza. The church and convent survive today but are entirely seventeenth century in construction.⁴⁵

It appears, therefore, that Carafa had originally intended a college for his home town. In this respect he was following Cortese's recommendation that the cardinal should endow places of education and provide such facilities for students from his own town or country.⁴⁶ He also had before him the example of a number of his fellow cardinals. Cardinals Domenico Capranica and Stefano Nardini both left financial provision for the foundation of such establishments within their palaces in Rome. Cardinal Niccolò Forteguerri also founded in 1473 a college in his home town of Pistoia. The act of foundation drawn up on 23 August, 1473, and published by Beani, provides an interesting insight as to the administration, financing and educational curriculum of such enterprises. The college was to comprise twelve students of at least eighteen years of age who were either born in Pistoia or its contado. 'Foreigners' who had lived in the city for twenty years might also be eligible. An official body (Ufficiali di Sapienza) would administer the college but, during his lifetime, the Cardinal would be entitled to elect three of the twelve scholars and this right would be extended to a

member of his family after his death. The students could study either theology, canon and civil law or medicine, but only one of the twelve could opt for medicine. The educational aims were therefore entirely geared towards the clerical profession. Judging from surviving evidence about the function and syllabus of other such institutions, the Sapienza in Naples would also have been intended as a place of education for young Neapolitans, with a particular emphasis on the study of theology and canon law in order to prepare them for an ecclesiastical career.⁴⁷ Such intentions fit well with the picture we have of Carafa as a traditional but thoroughly professional cleric who wished to share his expertise with others.

In his home town, Carafa's commissions were due in no small part to his exalted position first as Archbishop and later Cardinal of Naples. His high status enabled him to act as head of the Carafa family, keeping his relatives' interests at heart, arranging for the erection of funerary monuments in the family chapel at San Domenico Maggiore and possibly improving the fabric of the family palace at San Marcellino. Once Archbishop of Naples, he restored his palace and in a later period of archiepiscopal office furnished his cathedral with a new high altarpiece. He also promoted the cult of Saint Januarius by building the Succorpo as a reliquary chapel for the saint and establishing that chapel as a place of burial for members of his immediate family within the very heart of the cathedral. An early awareness of the ecclesiastical tradition to which he belonged is indicated by his restoration of San Gennaro extra moenia, the burial site of a number of

his most revered predecessors. Finally, in his pastoral capacity he supplied the city with a hospital and would also have given it a university had not death intervened. Overall the picture given is that of his Roman commissions - orthodox, ecclesiastical and highly public-spirited.

Notes to Chapter 7

¹See Hersey, Alfonso II and the artistic renewal at Naples, passim. The library founded by the House of Aragon was justly famous and has been reconstructed with great care in De Marinis, La biblioteca napoletano dei re d'Aragona, passim.

²See above, chapter 5, pp. 315-6.

³The literature on the seggi is enormous. The most helpful in terms of history and function are C. Tutini, Dell'origine e fundatione de'Seggi di Napoli (3 vols., Naples, 1644); M. Schipa, 'Contese sociali napoletane, Archivio storico per le province napoletane, XXXII (1907), pp. 314-377.

⁴These are: the Palazzi Carafa di Maddaloni, 121, Via di S. Biagio dei Librai (see below); Carafa di Montorio, 30, Via di S. Biagio, birthplace of Giovanni Pietro Carafa (Paul IV) and enlarged by Cardinal Carlo Carafa; Carafa d'Andria, Largo S. Marcellino (see below); Carafa di Belvedere a San Domenico, 29 and 34, Vicolo S. Geronimo; Carafa della Spina, 45, Via Croce. During the sixteenth century a number of Carafa palaces were built in what was then the suburban district of Pizzofalcone, the most splendid being that of Andrea Carafa, Count of S. Severino. This palace in the Via Egiziaca at Pizzofalcone is now the Archivio Militare. Andrea Carafa nevertheless chose to endow a funerary chapel in San Domenico Maggiore (see below, note 26) in the heart of the traditional family enclave. For the Palazzo Carafa at Pizzofalcone and the Palazzo Carafa di Montorio, see L. Catalani, I palazzi di Napoli (Naples, 1969), pp. 57-8, 59-60.

⁵This particular aspect of Renaissance society has attracted a great deal of attention lately, drawing much of its inspiration from social anthropology. This approach is best exemplified by F.W.Kent, Household and lineage in Renaissance Florence; Ibid. & D.V.Kent, Neighbours and neighbourhood in Renaissance Florence. See also the publications cited above, chapter 1, note 10.

⁶See below, pp. 387-91.

⁷Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, pp. 5, 7; Scandone 'I Carafa', tav. XIX, states that the property was part of Carafa's mother, Maria Origlia's dowry. There are no signs of Francesco's villa or the Franciscan priory in Portici, a town which in 1631 was devastated by an eruption from Mount Vesuvius.

⁸See Gombrich, 'The early Medici as patrons of art', pp. 35-57.

⁹Examples of this type of decorative rustication survive on the Palazzo Como, now the Museo Filangieri, and the Palazzo Sanseverino, now incorporated in the church of the Gesù Nuovo. See Catalani, I palazzi di Napoli, pp. 32-3, 36-8; Pane, Il Rinascimento, pp. 211-2, Pl. 218, pp. 214-22, Pls. 229-32.

¹⁰IN HONOREM OPTIMI REGIS FERDINANDI ET SPENDOREM NOBILISSI[MAE]
PATRIAE DIOMEDES CARRAFA COMES MATALONE MCCCCLXVI.

¹¹HAS COM/ES INSIGNIS /DIOMEDES /CONDIDIT AE/DES CAR[R]AFA /IN LAUDE
M. R/EGIS PATRIAE /QUE DECOREM.

¹²In 1473 Diomede entertained Sigismondo d'Este who came to Naples in order to escort his future sister in law, Eleanor of Aragon, to Ferrara. In 1475, Anthony, Bastard of Burgundy, visited Naples and was entertained by Diomede in his new palace. See Petrucci, 'Diomede Carafa', p. 526.

¹³For a more detailed analysis of the palace architecture and its history see, G. Ceci, 'Il Palazzo dei Carafa di Maddaloni', Napoli Nobilissima, II (1893), pp. 149-53, 168-70; Pane, Il Rinascimento I, pp. 209-11, Pls. 212-5.

¹⁴Summonte, Lettera a Michiel, p. 166.

¹⁵Giulio Cesare Capaccio, Il Forastiero (1630), published in O. Morisani, Letteratura artistica a Napoli tra il '400 ed il '600, (Naples, 1958), pp. 105-6: 'Diomede Carafa. . . tanto curioso dell'antichità, che per ornar da dovero la sua abitatione, mandò in busca per tutto il contorno per haver statue, e n'ebbe molte, e vi ritrovarete uno Scipione Africano che comparisce ignudo in Senato, quando fu chiamato a dar conto. E se fusse stato vivo questo Signore pochi anni a dietro, non havrebbe lasciata per qualsivoglia tesoro la testa di Annibale ritrovata in Capoa, fra bellissimi ornamenti di marmo nel podere d'un prete, da chi fu venduta al Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandino. Trovarete anco un Hercole. Il Serapi effigiato in un bue menato al sacrificio. Un trionfo di Amori in un'urna di marmo. Un sacerdote di Cerere. La statua di Flora, c'han pensato alcuni che sia l'Annona. In una tavola vi piacerranno gli amori del Cigno e di Leda. Le Gratie. Il Tempo con bellissimi geroglifici. Perseo col Centauro. Nettuno col tridente. Cerere con le Canistifere. L'imagini di Cesare, di Augusto, di Agrippa, di Nerone, e quella di Marco Tullio, che in vederla par che ori. Et assai bella una testa di cavallo in bronzo, credesi che fusse di un cavallo dedicato a Nettuno equestre, che anticamente haveano i Napolitani, e fusse quello a chi Corrado pose il freno. Sopra la porta una Venere. Intorno alle mura di fore varie teste. Serbando anco nel cortile il buon Signore, per memoria di servitù, una picciola statua di Ferdinando a cavallo sopra una colonna come trofeo. Et altri fragmenti di varie bellezze'. Schrader, Monumentorum, p. 248, also refers to the Hercules and Neptune figures and the imperial portraits mentioned in the above account. Sarnelli, Guida della città di Napoli, pp. 54-5, and Celano, Notizie della città di Napoli, III, p. 679, also praise Diomede's fabulous collection of antiques. Aldimari, Historia genealogia, II, p. 94, states that Diomede's collection cost him approximately 17000 scudi.

¹⁶A. Billi, Il Libro, ed. C. von Fabriczy (Stuttgart, 1891), p. 320 n.42. Vasari-Milanesi, II, p. 409, n. H. W. Janson, The sculpture of Donatello (Princeton, 1957), II, p. 195. B. A. Bennett & D. G. Wilkins,

Donatello (Oxford, 1984), pp. 93-4. Pane, Il Rinascimento, I, pp. 168-9 maintains that the horsehead is by Donatello.

¹⁷De Marinis, La biblioteca de re Aragona, I, pp. 43, 49, 50, 57, 79, 119, 143, 149, 166, II, pp. 11, 42-3, 52-3, 258-60, 263-5, 269-70, Supp., pp. 31, 38-9, 62, 210; F. Petrucci, 'Per un'edizione critica dei Memoriali di Diomede Carafa: problemi e metodo', Archivio storico per le province napoletane 4th ser., XV (1976), pp. 213-34.

¹⁸Hill, A corpus of Italian medals I, p. 214, no. 824, II, Pl. 134. On the reverse is a depiction of a female allegorical figure (possibly Salus) carrying a cornucopia and the stadera and below a motto, fine in tanto, a sentiment which also appears on Diomede's tomb in the Cappella Carafa in San Domenico Maggiore (see above, p. 388).

¹⁹Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, p. 19; Chioccarello Antistitum, p. 299; D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, pp. 336-7; Celano, Notizie, III, pp. 698, 706. For brief references by modern authors to the Palazzo Carafa d'Andria, see Pane, Il Rinascimento, I, p. 50; T.C.L.: Napoli e dintorni (Milan, 1976), p. 149; R. Pane et al., Il centro antico di Napoli (Naples, 1971), II, pp. 384-5, Pl. 232, III, p. 77.

²⁰Valle and Minichini, Descrizione di S. Domenico Maggiore, passim.

²¹Pane, Il Rinascimento, I, p. 101. Schrader, Monumentorum, pp. 225-6, records the epitaph on Malizia's tomb.

²²See above, chapter 4, note 109.

²³FRANCISCO CARRAPHA EQUITI NEAPOLITANOI INSIGNI CHRISTIANAE /RELIGIONIS OBSERVANTISS[IMO] QUI SUMMA OMNIUM MORTALIUM BENIVO/LENTIA AC VENERATIONE AETATIS ANNUM AGENS LXXXIIII OBIIT SENII /NUNQUAM QUESTUS OLIVERIUS CARD[INALIS] NEAPOLITANUS] PARENTI OPTIMO POS[UIT].

²⁴Francesco's epitaph reads: 'Par vit[ale]/ religionis/ exitus'; Diomede's: 'Huic/ virtus gloriam glo/ria immortalitate[m]/ comparavit'.

²⁵For the d'Alagno contract, see Filangieri, Documenti, III, pp. 28-9, VI, p. 474. For discussion of the Carafa tombs and their authorship, see Muñoz, 'Tommaso Malvito da Como', p. 91, Pane, Il Rinascimento, II, p. 156.

²⁶Another branch of the Carafa family endowed a spacious chapel to the right of the entrance of the church. The inscription over the entrance arch names the founder as Andrea Carafa, Count of Sanseverino, and gives the date, 1508. The chapel also contains the tombs of Galeotto Carafa (d. 1513) and his wife, Rosaria Pietramelara (See Pane, Il Rinascimento, II, Pls. 128, 129, 205). The chapel has been attributed to Romolo Balsimelli. On the Piazza di San Domenico, an exterior balcony on the east wall of the north transept, displays the Carafa coat of arms with a mitre above it, together with the stadera and hide. (Ibid., II, Pl. 118.) The style of the balcony suggests that it is early sixteenth century. It may be due to Oliviero Carafa's relative, Bernardino, who was made Archbishop of Naples in 1503.

De Stefano, Descrittione della città di Napoli, fol. 110^r refers to his tomb in a chapel to the left of the choir of San Domenico. It no longer survives but Schrader, Monumentorum, p. 226, records the epitaph on this tomb.

²⁷For Belverte's contract, see Filangieri, Documenti, III, pp. 585-9, V, p. 49. For a recent assessment of the chapel and its artistic monuments, see Pane, Il Rinascimento, II, pp. 157, 164, Pls. 140-1. Ettore also added rooms to the studium of the Dominican priory and an infirmary. See Filangieri, Documenti, III, p. 11; Scandone, 'I Carafa', tav. XIX.

²⁸Chioccarello, *ibid.*, p. 29; Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, pp. 17-8. In 1484, Alessandro Carafa completed a campaign of restoration on the cathedral chancel which may have received the endorsement of his cardinal brother. See Chioccarello, *ibid.*, p. 312, who records an inscription on a pier in the chancel which once read: 'Mentem sanctam spontaneam honorem deo et patriae liberationem: Alexander Carrafa Archiepiscopus Neapolitanus fecit'. At that time, the polygonal shaped fourteenth-century apse contained several tombs of the Angevin royal family and other notable ecclesiastics. These were dismantled during the construction of the Succorpo and then replaced in a different order. As part of the eighteenth-century campaign of renovation on the chancel, these tombs were finally removed and placed in other parts of the cathedral. See F. Strazzullo, 'Le vicende dell'apside del Duomo di Napoli', in Studi in onore di Domenico Mallardo (Naples, 1957), pp. 148-151, 154.

²⁹Strazzullo, 'Le vicende dell'apside', p. 151.

³⁰Vasari, Le vite, I, p. 547; Vasari-Milanesi, III, p. 578: 'una Assunzione di Nostra Donna'.

³¹G.A. Galante, La tribuna del Duomo di Napoli (Naples, 1874), p. 20. In 1597 the painting was transferred by Cardinal Gesualdo to the chancel apse where it continued to function as the high altarpiece until its removal as part of the renovation of the chancel in 1744. See Strazzullo, 'Le vicende dell'apside', pp. 154-6. The painting is now located in a chapel at the end of the south transept.

³²D'Engenio, Napoli sacra, p. 4: 'Nella tavola poi dell'altar maggiore vi è dipinta l'Assunta, e gli Apostoli intorno alla sepultura, la qual a richiesta di Vincenzo Carrafa Arcivescovo, e Cardinal, fù fatta dal famoso pittor Pietro Perugino, il qual fiorì nel 1460. E ne' tempi del Cardinal Gesualdo fù ritoccata, e dorata, come de presente si vede. Sarnelli, Guida della città di Napoli, p. 78: 'Nella tavola dell'altar maggiore v'è dipinta la Santissima Vergine Assunta, e gli Apostoli attorno alla sepultura, la quale a richiesta di Vincenzo Carrafa Cardinal Arcivescovo, fù fatta dal famoso pittore Pietro Perugino, che fiorì nell'anno 1460'. Celano, Notizie, II, pp. 96-8: 'La tavola maggiore, dove sta espressa la Vergine Assunta, con li Santi Apostoli di sotto, e un cardinale inginocchiato, quale è il ritratto al naturale di Cardinale Oliviero Carrafa, per ordine del quale fu la detta tavola

dipinta, è ella opera di Pietro Perugino, che fu maestro di Raffaele d'Urbino'.

³³See 'Vincenzo Carafa', DBI, XIX, p. 613.

³⁴De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, p. 42, records an inscription which once read: 'Vincentius Carraffa cardinalis Neapolitanus'.

³⁵Panel, 500 x 330 cm., in poor condition with two long vertical cracks clearly visible on its surface. The painting was last restored in 1960. See the Catalogo dell'IV mostra di restauri a cura della Soprintendenza alle Gallerie della Campania (Naples, 1960), pp. 51-3.

³⁶Strazzullo, 'Le vicende dell'apside', p. 151. S. Ferino Pagden, Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello (exhibition catalogue), (Florence, 1982), p. 60. Fiorenzo Canuti, Il Perugino (Siena, 1931), I, pp. 197-8, refers briefly to two documents dated 2 May, 1499, and 23 April, 1500, connected with commissions given to Perugino in Naples but neither apparently refer to the Duomo altarpiece. For a summary of recent critical views on the degree of collaboration and the date of this painting plus bibliography, see P. Scarpellini, Perugino (Milan, 1984), cat. no. 160, pp. 117-8.

³⁷See above, chapter 4, p. 198 and note 98.

³⁸In 1490 Ludovico Sforza's agent recommended Perugino's work to his master on the grounds that 'sue cose hano aria angelica e molto dolce'. See Baxandall, Painting and experience, p. 28.

³⁹Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 297-8; Aldimari, Historia genealogica, III, pp. 17-18.

⁴⁰See above, chapter 5, p. 288. Saint Agrippinus (2nd century) Saint Januarius (4th century) and Saint Athanasius (9th century) were all buried in the catacombs. The relics of Saints Agrippinus and Januarius were later transferred to the cathedral. See De Lellis, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra, pp. 40-1; Galante, La tribuna del Duomo di Napoli, pp. 448-9. All three patron saints of Naples figure on the sculpted ceiling of the Succorpo. See above, chapter 5, p. 301 and Table IV.

⁴¹See E. Lavagnino, 'I lavori di ripristino della basilica di San Gennaro extra moenia a Napoli', Bollettino dell'arte, n.s. VIII (1928-9), pp. 145-66; *ibid.*, 'Osservazioni sulla topografia della catacomba di San Gennaro extra moenia a Napoli', Bollettino dell'arte, n.s. IX, 1929-30, pp. 337-54; R. Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine architecture (rev. ed. 1975), p. 208.

⁴²Celano, Notizie, V, pp. 307-8, 312-3; Galante, La tribuna del Duomo di Napoli, p. 449.

⁴³Sarnelli, Guida della città di Napoli, p. 111: 'Questo, che hoggi è nobilissimo monistero delle Suore dell'Ordine di S. Domenico, era stato

dal principio destinato per un studio di poveri studenti, desiderosi di acquistar le buone lettere, opera santissima, incominciata dal Cardinale Oliviero Arcivescovo di Napoli del 1507. Il quale pervenuto dalla morte non potè compire quanto haveva determinato, onde compiuta da altri la fabbrica, fù fatto monistero'. Cf. Chioccarello, Antistitum, p. 303; Aldimari, Historia della genealogica, III, pp. 21-22.

⁴⁴Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples, fondo S. Martino, MS. 444: 'in eius domibus sitis in platea Nidi civitatis Neap. de et supra divisione facienda bonorum hereditariorum quondam R.mi Cardinalis Oliverij Carrafe mortui anno 1509 inter R.mum Vincentium Carrafam Archiepiscopum Neapolitanum ac Comitem Ayrolae et Comitem Rubeorum et alios de domo Carrafa; et inter coetara bona nominata et divisa in ditta sententia arbitrali in vulgari sermone promulgata; dividitur inter eos domus Sapienciae per dictum D. Cardinalem coepta in pertinentiis Nidi in Vico Solis et Lunae, iuxta bona Ill. domini ducis Andrie, Berardini de Cioffo, heredum Angeli dela Lama, Bernardini de Francho, viam publicam, cum omni suo apparatu lignaminum, petrarum laboratarum et non laboratarum, calcis, et omnium aliarum rerum emptarum ad opus ditti edificiij, una cum omnibus domibus dirutis et non dirutis, censibus, viridarijs, territorijs ubicumque sitis emptis ad opus ditti edificiij Sapienciae. Quae domus Sapienciae per dittum arbitrum fuit assignata supradicto R.mo D.Vincentio archiepiscopo et D. Antonio comiti Ruborum et D. Jacobo Carrafe'.

⁴⁵A. Colombo, 'Il monastero e la chiesa di Santa Maria della Sapienza', Napoli Nobilissima, X (1901), pp. 145-6; R. de Maio, Le origini del Seminario di Napoli (Naples, 1958), pp. 25-7; Strazzullo, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa', p. 18, n.38.

⁴⁶Cortesius, De cardinalitu, 'De erogatione pecuniarum', Lib. II. cap. XI, fol. 104^v: 'quod Car. debent construere domos sapientiae quod Car. debent facere domos sapientiae secundum nationes suas'.

⁴⁷For Cardinal Capranica's foundation, see M. Mopurgo-Castelnovo, 'Il Cardinale Domenico Capranica', Archivio della Reale Società Romana di storia patria, LII (1929), pp. 1-146, esp. pp. 89-100; Antonovics, 'The library of Cardinal Domenico Capranica'; for Cardinal Nardini, see G. Zippel, 'Il palazzo del Governo Vecchio', Capitolium, VI, 2 (1930), pp. 365-77, esp. pp. 366-8; for Cardinal Forteguerri, see G. Beani, Niccolò Forteguerri, Cardinal di Teano: notizie storiche (Pistoia, 1891), pp. 51-60, doc. IX, pp. 105-117. For the Studio Romano, see the publication cited above, chapter 3, note 129.

CHAPTER VIII

Conclusion

The biographical study of Oliviero Carafa as a Renaissance cardinal patron has proved an effective vehicle for analysis and, in particular, has facilitated the identification of both the distinctive nature of Carafa's patronage and its place within Renaissance patronage in general. First, it has enabled a proper and satisfactorily subtle distinction to be made between Renaissance patronage as clientelismo and Renaissance patronage as mecenatismo.¹ Second, and more significantly, it has demonstrated the necessary interdependence of the one on the other.

The biographical account given in chapter two demonstrates how Carafa was (and was seen by his contemporaries to be) party to the complex organisations and processes of Renaissance clientelismo. Particularly in his latter years as a respected senior member of the Sacred College (and one apparently capable of influencing as strong-willed a pope as Julius II), he was deemed by the Venetian Republic a person worth cultivating at the Holy See. Similarly, analysis of his complex relations with the Aragonese rulers of Naples enables one to perceive how Carafa was at first beholden to Ferrante for his promotion as Archbishop and Cardinal of Naples, but subsequently was able to pursue an increasingly independent line from his royal patrons, offering or withdrawing his co-operation according to his judgement of the merits of

the case. One particularly compelling instance of Carafa's growing autonomy and status as a patron is the process by which the acquisition of the relics of Saint Januarius began as an initiative on the part of King Ferrante yet ended as an act of benevolent patronage wholly attributed by his contemporaries to Cardinal Carafa.

Likewise the analysis of his dealings with the Dominican Order reveals him as a patron well able to dispense favours and benefits to the Order as a whole and to individual members in particular. His position within the Sacred College and the papal Curia - which enabled him to be a party to many political and diplomatic affairs in Italy, and indeed all Christendom - made him particularly competent in this respect. It was undoubtedly for similar reasons that first Lorenzo, then Piero, de'Medici valued his opinion on matters of state. Thus Wolf's description of the most effective patrons being those individuals who stand at the 'critical synapses'² which bind local interests to a wider arena, proves a particularly apposite model for an assessment of the nature and impact of Carafa's political patronage.

Strazzullo's choice of title for his biographical piece on Carafa - 'Il cardinale Oliviero Carafa mecenate del Rinascimento' - highlights effectively another crucial facet of Carafa's patronage, namely his role as a generous and imaginative mecenate of both scholars and artists. Notable amongst the rich choice of examples are: his choice as secretary of the Paduan humanist, Andrea Brenta, and his support of Brenta's study and translation of such diverse authors as Hippocrates and Saint John Chrysostom; his shrewd assessment of Cajetan's potential as Master

General of the Dominicans; his close friendship with this saintly man and his inspired encouragement of Cajetan's magnum opus on Aquinas' Summa theologiae; his willingness to accept Lorenzo de' Medici's recommendation of Filippino Lippi as an able painter to work on the mural scheme for his chapel in Rome, and his receptivity to Filippino's innovative re-interpretation of traditional iconographic themes; and his generous funding and imaginative sponsorship of a grander and even more self-consciously all'antica scheme for his chapel in the cathedral of Naples.

Yet, as anticipated in chapter one, these manifestations of Carafa's mecenatismo arose from the closely-knit web of patron-client relations that surrounded him and in whose transactions he immersed himself. Andrea Brenta left Padua for Rome in order to secure patronage within the Curia where he knew humanists of his calibre would receive gainful employment. In return for the financial support, professional contacts and career promotion that he gained from his situation within Carafa's household, he provided a body of humanist texts which, by their dedications, associated Carafa with this scholarly endeavour. Brenta himself encapsulates their relationship by his reference in the dedication to the Oratio in pentecosten to Carafa as patron and himself as client.⁹ Similarly the careers of Giovanni Battista Almadiano and Jacopo Sadoletto benefitted from their close association with Cardinal Carafa as members of his scholarly and well-governed household.

Carafa's support of Cajetan's scholarship (which, from the contents of the Cardinal's library, appears to have encompassed Cajetan's earlier

commentaries on Aristotle as well as his later study of Aquinas⁴) was also governed as much by political considerations as by motives of enlightened cultural patronage. Carafa, in his role as Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans, clearly wanted to guide the fortunes of the Order on a course which he saw as beneficial for it. In order to achieve this aim he wanted its government to be in the hands of men who, like himself, were sympathetic to reform but, unlike Savonarola, committed to a particular kind of theological orthodoxy and to the notion of papal authority. One such man was, of course, Cajetan, and, as discussed in chapters two and three, Carafa took energetic measures to promote Cajetan within the Dominican order - measures which culminated in his election as Master General.

Turning to his ostensibly artistic projects, it is apparent that the commission and execution of Carafa's chapel schemes for both Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the Succorpo in Naples' cathedral were governed by a combination of the cardinal's professional and personal commitments. Thus the Roman commission arose in part from his official duties as Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans and in part from his wish as a Neapolitan and head of the Carafa clan to promote the cult of his ancestor, Saint Thomas Aquinas. While such acts of artistic patronage tend to be seen as purely altruistic, in this case, at least, the richly embellished chapel and its endowment further secured Carafa's control over the Dominicans by simultaneously enhancing his reputation as an enlightened patron of the Order and obtaining the friars' services for the performance of a generous number of requiem masses on behalf of himself and his heirs.

In a comparable fashion his foundation of a reliquary chapel in honour of Naples' major patron saint, Januarius, arose from his energetic efforts to obtain the saint's relics for his home town and more particularly for the cathedral over which he, or a close relative, had control. The dual function which he envisaged for this chapel as both reliquary chapel and family funerary chapel demonstrates effectively how this particular act of art patronage was governed by a peculiar blend of loyalties and emotions arising from Carafa's patronal status as both head of the Carafa clan and Cardinal Archbishop of Naples. Thus the term 'patronage' has served its purpose well, since its very ambiguity of meaning offers a means of encompassing the highly diversified manifestations of Carafa's activities as a patron.

As suggested in the introductory chapter, one dimension of this study is the possibility it offers for a re-evaluation of the kinds of morality in which Carafa as a high-ranking ecclesiastical patron was involved. As noted by Weissman⁵, Renaissance patronage relied on and could only work successfully if such social values as fraternal love, loyalty, reciprocity and a deferential sense of subordination were acknowledged. That Carafa operated in such a climate has been made evident by reference to the numerous encomiums addressed to him throughout his lifetime. At first sight their high-flown language, expressing an exaggerated sense of gratitude and servility, gives an impression of Carafa as an all powerful and autocratic figure. The sense of reciprocity is not therefore very apparent. Nevertheless, it has to be recognised that in these dedications one is witnessing a conventional

literary genre which effectively masks a mutually profitable transaction between the dedicatee and the author.

Clearly the humanists and theologians who dedicated their works to Carafa were aware of his scholarly interests in Greek classical authors, the early Church Fathers, Saint Thomas Aquinas and contemporary political issues. They thus sought to match their scholarly endeavour to such interests. Yet his was also a name which carried with it sufficient associations of political power and social standing to improve the author's reputation as a scholar. Likewise Carafa's own reputation as a cardinal prince of the Church, offering his enlightened patronage to men of letters, could only gain from such literary productions.

This sense of reciprocity, and the intricate set of manoeuvres that marked out such a co-operative relationship, emerges even more strongly in the analysis of Carafa's diplomatic relations with the Medici family. Perhaps the most striking instance of this mutually advantageous and reversible process occurs in the reconstruction of the circumstances surrounding Carafa's commission to Filippino Lippi to paint his chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. Here one sees how Lorenzo de' Medici used his position of power and influence to facilitate the progress of a project initiated by Carafa. Yet a few months later, Lorenzo was requesting Carafa's assistance in the matter of securing a cardinal's hat for his son, Giovanni. Moreover the processes by which this transaction was negotiated were far more ambiguous and complex than this rather bald summary suggests. It involved, for example, many other

patron-client networks: the two principal protagonists' powers of coercion over Filippo Strozzi; Carafa's influential position within the Dominican Order and by extension over the prior of Santa Maria Novella, Florence; Filippino Lippi's indebtedness to the Medici family as his and his father's long-standing patrons; and Filippino's relations with his current contracted patron, Filippo Strozzi.

Carafa's initial hostility towards Giovanni's rapid collection of wealthy benefices stands oddly when viewed in conjunction with his own innumerable benefices and his energetic efforts to acquire others for his family. His acquiescence to Giovanni's election as cardinal, coming so soon after his employment of Lorenzo de' Medici's protégé, Filippino Lippi, could, in the circumstances, be interpreted as an act of pure opportunism, showing a marked lack of integrity. These questions of political trimming, pluralism and nepotism bring us to the heart of the moral paradox that Oliviero Carafa and his patronage represent.

Setting aside the literary hyperbole characteristic of Renaissance encomiums, the overriding impression one gains from eye-witness reports of Carafa's personal qualities is that he was a man universally admired for his sagacity and moral integrity. One quality that stands out as remarkable, and one that would not necessarily need to be referred to by contemporary commentators, was the frugality and morality practised by Carafa in the government of his household. Coupled with consistent and frequent allusions to his personal morality, is the record of an evidently sincere and sustained interest in religious reform. Such an

interest manifested itself in his frequent membership of specially appointed commissions to investigate the reform of both the Curia and various religious orders, his association with either new reform orders such as the Canons Regular, or reform parties within long-established orders like the Dominicans and Vallombrosans, his sympathy for the zeal of reformers such as Savonarola, and his promulgation of additional constitutions for his suburbican bishopric of Sabina.

Set against this involvement with reform is the overwhelming evidence for his participation in three of the classic venal abuses that perennially plagued the Church - simony, pluralism and nepotism. One has only to study Table III to ascertain that Carafa was guilty of possessing more than one sacred office - additional offices, moreover, which had been purchased by money. It has also become increasingly clear that he gained great wealth from the revenues and properties of these listed abbeys and bishoprics, making him one of, although not the, richest of the cardinals in the Sacred College, well able to pay above the average for the two chapel foundations that he established during his lifetime. He also used sacred office for the aggrandizement of his family - the most striking example of this kind of venality being his proprietary attitude towards the archiepiscopal title of Naples, which through a pattern of resignation and reservation remained securely within either his, or one or other of his 'close relatives', control.

The dilemma that Cardinal Carafa faced is best illustrated by the evidently sincere recommendations for reform of the papal Curia that he himself penned as member of Alexander VI's reform commission. In this

document Carafa expresses concern for the perennial abuses that affected the Church and the management of its resources. From its contents it is possible to gain an insight as to the tension between, on the one hand, Carafa's exemplary personal morality and disposition towards reform and, on the other, his reluctance to do away with a system which enabled him to operate effectively as a patron of his family and clients.

These venal abuses to which Carafa was a party were not new phenomena within the Church and more specifically the papal Curia. Wolfgang Reinhard has traced nepotism, for example, back to the earliest days of the Church. Indeed it is his contention that by the sixteenth century nepotism had become an accustomed social norm, a form of 'piety' which derived its meaning from the classical pre-Christian sense of the word - pietas - honouring one's homeland, ancestors and family.⁶ While it is undeniable that papal nepotism, particularly from the papacy of Calixtus III onwards,⁷ had increased in strength and prevalence, it should be acknowledged, however, that a certain uneasiness about its existence was prevalent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and lay behind certain of the popes' promulgations and reform initiatives.

Despite this new sensibility towards the misuse of the Church's wealth, many of Carafa's actions provide compelling instances of his fulfilling obligations to his relatives as a mark of his honour and that of his family. His attitude towards the archbishopric of Naples provides one compelling example of this style of pietas. Having obtained the title, he used it as a means of continuing and enhancing the grandezza of the Carafa, by establishing a clerical dynasty who handed the title on from

one member of the family to the next. As a further means of securing his family's claims to that sacred office, he left his imprint upon the fabric of the cathedral by building a large-scale and well-appointed chapel whose patronage was a charge on his descendants. He also provided the high altar - the focal point of any church interior - with an altarpiece which in its design made a bold analogy with the high altarpiece of the Sistine chapel, the showpiece of fifteenth-century papal patronage. Moreover, while giving his family a way of bettering itself through the sacred offices of the Church, he was also conscious of the need to provide for his gens by further consolidating its status amongst the Neapolitan nobility. He secured papal permission to name as his legal heirs his surviving brothers and nephews and thus insured their right of inheritance to the villa on the Quirinal, Rome, the chapel of the Succorpo, and the unbuilt property of the Sapienza in Naples. Moreover, in his act of obtaining the title of the Count of Ruvo for his younger brother, Ettore, one sees Carafa acting as one with others of his fellow cardinals and founding a rich legacy for the lay members of his family.

Carafa's wholesale exploitation of the Church's wealth through the acquisition of sacred offices is more explicable when his position and status as a cardinal of the Church are taken into consideration. Recent work on Renaissance Rome has demonstrated convincingly that pomp and luxury were increasingly central to life at the papal court and that the cardinals were expected to keep pace with such conspicuous consumption. As it is, Carafa appears to have tried to exercise some moderation in this respect, particularly as regards the running of his household,

which for some of his fellow cardinals had taken on the guise of princely courts. Nevertheless, he and his household had a highly public profile and made their appearance regularly in the round of lavishly staged liturgical, ceremonial, and processional events which marked out the calendar of the papal court. In order to fulfill such obligatory duties, Carafa needed the financial wherewithal (or, at the very least, the reputation to acquire the necessary credit from Rome's ever-obliging moneylenders) to ensure that his retainers could appear on these occasions in a sufficiently resplendent manner. He also performed the customary duty of providing hospitality to princes and potentates.

How does one resolve the moral paradox that Carafa and his patronage presents? Barbara McLung Hallman in her study of the sixteenth-century cardinalate and its attitude towards church property and fiscal reform provides one hypothesis which can be adapted to Carafa's case. From her wider perspective she observes:

As the taste for luxury in Rome increased . . . the needs of cardinals and popes correspondingly increased. Any reform directed towards the reduction of incomes would have been incompatible with the private interests of their families. Any serious tampering with the fiscal practices and bureaucratic systems of the Roman Curia would inevitably have disrupted private ambitions. Any diminution of the powers of the popes would have deprived Italians of their principal patron. The realities of the time, then, deflected the reform efforts of the cardinals away from material matters, and focussed them upon things spiritual'.²

The instances that she cites of such spiritual reform are coloured by the fact that she is discussing sixteenth-century cardinals, many of whom were involved in the doctrinal reforms of the sessions of the Council of Trent and the office of the Inquisition. Other manifestations that she gives of this shift in focus cover, however, the reformation of monasteries, foundations of seminaries, the support of new religious orders, the foundation of charitable organisations such as hospitals and orphanages, and the construction and embellishment of churches and palaces in the Eternal City.

In scrutinising this list, it is striking how many of these doctrinal, pious and charitable activities can also be attributed to Carafa, albeit half a century earlier. Hallman's arguments thus provide some insight as to why Carafa's contemporaries saw no contradiction in viewing Carafa as a morally upright reform-minded person despite the fact that he was known to hold multiple sacred offices and provide for his own.⁹ Indeed this whole issue provides a demonstration of the kind of moral climate in which Carafa operated as a patron. His practice of venal abuses against the Church and its property arose from what he and his contemporaries judged as more important moral imperatives - the maintenance of a magnificent life-style appropriate to a cardinal prince of the Church, improvement of the fortunes of his family and fellow countrymen, and attentiveness to the spiritual and material welfare of religious orders placed under his care.

One vivid illustration of Carafa attending to the latter can be observed in his relationship with the Dominicans, analysed in chapter two. One

could argue that his interpretation of his office as Cardinal Protector bordered on the autocratic. This is certainly the opinion of the Dominican scholar, Mortier, who punctuates his history of the Order with criticism of Carafa's attempts to erode the independence of the Dominicans. Even the less partisan Forte tends to see Carafa's period of office as one when the Cardinal Protector gained new powers and influence. Set against this negative picture of Carafa as Cardinal Protector of the Dominicans, are such considerations as his enlightened patronage of Cajetan whose contribution to scholarship can only be seen as a positive factor. In addition, Carafa's promotion of other orthodox figures such as Vincenzo Bandello and Ludovico da Ferrara gives an insight into what motivated his close scrutiny and constant intervention into the Order's affairs. By his support of those Dominicans whose sympathies lay with the reforming Observant wing, he demonstrated that he wanted the best for the spiritual life of the Order, but only if the campaign of reform was carried out within a framework of theological orthodoxy and tacit support for papal supremacy.

It is also clear, moreover, from public statements issued by numerous Dominican writers, that the Order was grateful to Carafa for his support in their affairs. One compelling instance of this occurs in the 1498 funerary oration composed by Timoteo de Totis in memory of the Dominican procurator general, Ludovico da Ferrara. In it Cardinal Oliviero Carafa's name occurs several times with the author alluding to him as a person who was deemed powerful, highly respected and an authority over the Dominican Order.¹⁰ While it would be unusual to find overt criticism of the Cardinal Protector set out in such a public and

honorific text, it can be recognised that Carafa represented a conservative and conventional stance and that he was admired for it. Thus it is possible to argue that he provided the Dominicans with a record of assiduous service on their behalf and promoted their interests in what he deemed to be an enlightened and beneficial way.

Renaissance cardinals could also legitimate their farming of the Church's wealth by founding charitable institutions and constructing and embellishing churches and conventual buildings. As has been seen in the preceding chapters, Carafa participated in just such kinds of pious and charitable activity. It should also be said that such programmes of public munificence had a long pedigree within the Italian cardinaliture and were therefore in one sense entirely traditional. Examples of such public-spirited patronage include: Cardinal Gaetano Giacomo Stefaneschi (b.c.1260, cr.1295, d.1343), who, apart from being a poet and hymnographer in his own right, employed a scriptorium and commissioned from Giotto murals for both San Giorgio in Velabro and Saint Peter's as well as a double-sided high altarpiece for the latter church; Cardinal Niccolò Capocci (cr.1350 d.1368) who endowed chapels in France and a funerary chapel for himself in Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome, and who, in 1367, founded the college of Santa Sofia in Perugia; Cardinal Rinaldo Brancaccio (cr.1384, d.1427), who contributed to his family's local church of San Domenico Maggiore, Naples, restored another neighbourhood church, Sant'Andrea a Nilo, and erected a chapel there which was graced by Donatello and Michelozzo's celebrated tomb for the cardinal himself; Cardinal Branda Castiglione (b.1360, cr.1411, d.1443) who founded the church of SS Stefano e Lorenzo at his birth place of Castello di

Castiglione a Olona, had that church's baptistery and a chapel in his titular church of San Clemente, Rome, frescoed by Masolino and founded a college and library for needy students in Pavia.' The art patronage of these fourteenth and early fifteenth-century cardinals thus shares certain characteristics with that of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa in that it was primarily associated with the sacred or with matters encompassed by the Church's teachings on charity and benevolence towards one's fellows. It tended to be commissions for new churches, chapels or conventual buildings, or contributions to the upkeep and refurbishment of older ecclesiastical foundations, or the inauguration of charitable and social institutions such as hospitals and universities. Very often, as in the case of Carafa, it encompassed both Rome and their place of birth. Allied to this patronage of ecclesiastical and charitable foundations was the commissioning of private monuments such as the family funeral chapel and palace.

One can discern, therefore, in Carafa's art patronage - his mecenatismo - a strong sense of tradition and continuity. This much is strikingly evident from the way that certain monuments commissioned at his behest show a marked sympathy towards the style and function of much older religious foundations. An example is his late fifteenth-century campaign of renovation at San Gennaro extra moenia, Naples, where certain features of this early Christian church were carefully reconstructed. Likewise in his chapel of the Succorpo he chose to have the ceiling embellished with depictions of his predecessors - the early bishops of Naples - and to adopt certain design features for this semi-subterranean chapel from those of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura in Rome.

On the one hand, Carafa shared with his cardinal predecessors a sense of tradition. On the other, his sense of tradition went apparently even deeper as manifested by his appreciation of paleo-Christian architecture, his evident enthusiasm for the aesthetic possibilities of the decorative repertoire of ancient art and his informed sense of the original function of certain antique artefacts. Further evidence that his mecenatismo was based upon classical models, albeit theoretical rather than purely visual, lies in Ludovico da Ferrara's funerary oration cited above. In it Timoteo de Totis refers to and praises Ludovico da Ferrara's translation for Carafa of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics.¹² The contents of this Dominican treatise are particularly revealing of Carafa's preoccupations and aspirations as a patron of art. For it is in the Nicomachean Ethics that Aristotle treats of magnificentia, a concept that greatly appealed to fifteenth-century humanists and their patrons alike since it provided positive endorsement for the sponsorship of great public enterprises.¹³

Prior to the fifteenth century, wealthy ecclesiastics such as Carafa had been under some restraint not to spend their wealth too openly. The Church traditionally promoted the Christian ideals of poverty and condemned the practice of usury. By the fifteenth century, however, the Church had to recognise that contemporary business practice was based on a system of credit, whilst fifteenth-century humanists put forward other arguments, based on classical precedent, for the possession of wealth. In particular they appropriated certain ethical ideas framed by Aristotle concerning the importance of wealth for the achievement of virtù. Central to this justification of the social value of wealth was

the concept of magnificence - the visual expression of a person's wealth be it in elaborate ceremonial, in possessions, or in buildings - all of which could bring an individual honour and respect.

In the Nicomachean Ethics Aristotle recommends to his reader that he should spend money on a grandiose and lavish scale, particularly if the project benefits the community at large:

The magnificent man is an artist in expenditure: he can discern what is suitable, and spend great sums with good taste ... great public benefactions are suitable for those who have adequate resources derived from their own exertions or from their ancestors or connections, and for the high-born and the famous and the like, since birth, fame and so on all have an element of greatness and distinction. The magnificent man therefore is especially of this sort, and Magnificence mostly finds an outlet in those public benefactions, since these are the greatest forms of expenditure and the most honoured...the magnificent man does not spend money on himself but on public objects, and his gifts have some resemblance to votive offerings.¹⁴

In many ways Aristotle's recommendations provide a key to the nature of Carafa's artistic projects which were in the main both well financed and designed for public use. Thus in the foundation and embellishment of the chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Carafa provided this principal Dominican church in Rome with a splendidly appointed chapel where the College of Cardinals gathered regularly to observe the public ritual of

the cappella papalis. Similarly, while the chapel of the Succorpo provided a private burial place for Carafa and members of his immediate family, it also functioned for a wider audience since it acted as a reliquary chapel for Saint Januarius - the major patron saint of Naples. Elsewhere Carafa provided well-appointed buildings for religious and civic communities and saw to the restoration and embellishment of ancient and revered churches. Even the institution of the feast of Pasquino could be seen as an act of benevolence towards the Roman populace, and thus another instance of Carafa self-consciously modelling himself upon Aristotle's directives for the practice of magnificence.

Aristotle's statements on the necessity of wealth and the use of that wealth as a form of 'votive offering' may well have provided Carafa with another form of moral justification for his exploitation of the Church's wealth by the accumulation of sacred offices. The classical author's highly élitist tone and his arguments as to how public munificence could only enhance the honour and reputation of the donor would also doubtless have appealed to Carafa. As has become increasingly clear, Carafa was a patron who saw the value of displaying and imposing his own aristocratic identity on the artistic monuments that he originated. The decorative schemes for the Minerva chapel and the Succorpo incorporate a large number of pictorial allusions to his family coat of arms and his personal imprese. Likewise his architectural schemes at Santa Maria della Pace, Santa Maria sopra Minerva and Santa Maria in Aracoeli were once all embellished with these heraldic devices. On a more intimate scale, a number of handsomely produced books which once belonged to him are also ornamented with his personal and family emblems. Somewhat

unusually for this date, three portraits of him on the scale of life survive, one an impressive sculptural piece (Pl. 96), and the other two part of painted altarpieces (Pl. 17, 153). Each once provided the visual focal point of a well-appointed interior designed for the performance of solemn liturgical ritual.

Much of the visual inventiveness that can be observed in the paintings in the Minerva can be attributed to Filippino Lippi's fertile imagination and pictorial skills. Nevertheless, it has also been possible to isolate certain key themes within the iconographical programme of the chapel which were so pertinent to Carafa's concerns and preoccupations that they must have been indicated to the painter by his cardinal patron. Thus the chapel as a whole presents a graphic illustration of that delicate, multifaceted, co-operative relationship that existed between a Renaissance patron, his painter and other parties who worked together in the creative generation of such schemes of artistic excellence. Turning to Carafa's architectural commission for the conventual buildings at Santa Maria della Pace, one can perceive a similar sense of mutual reciprocity. Carafa and the Canons Regular provided the up-and-coming Bramante with a brief to design a building whose architectural style would identify and honour both the patron and the religious order under his protection, while also providing the utilities essential to that religious community. Once these demands had been conveyed to the architect, Carafa had the imagination and good taste to grant Bramante a degree of autonomy whereby the architect could utilise his professional skills in the way he found most fitting.

Turning to the domestic sphere, it has become apparent from the discussion in chapter six of the villa on the Quirinal and the Palazzo Orsini that these private residences were also places of hospitality and sociability integral to the public life of any Renaissance cardinal. These buildings can thus be seen as further evidence of Cardinal Carafa's 'magnificence'. Moreover, by the end of the fifteenth century, the Neapolitan humanist, Giovanni Pontano, had developed the Aristotelian concept of magnificence and its presupposition of the virtue of wealth by endowing this idea with an aesthetic as well as an ethical dimension. In a series of five treatises written after 1494 and published in 1498, he treats both of magnificence and of a new virtue which he envisages as its complement, and which he designates as splendour.¹⁵ Whereas in his treatise on magnificence Pontano praises the custom of using private money for the public good and the ornament of one's country,¹⁶ in his treatise on splendour he argues that this virtue expresses itself in the elegance and refinement of a person's life, his furnishings, ornament and adornment of his town house as well as his country villa set amidst its garden and its display of antiquities:

*Sed magnificentia ipsa sumpsit nomen a magnitudine, versciturque in aedificiis, spectaculis, muneribus. At splendor, quod in ornamentis domesticis, in cultu corporis, in supelectile, in apparatu rerum diversarum praelucet, inde nomen a splendendo duxit.*¹⁷

David Coffin has rightly remarked that Pontano's recommendations would have been particularly pleasing to Renaissance cardinals whose vast but non-inheritable wealth would have made such conspicuous consumption

possible. He also observes that Cardinal Oliviero Carafa had close links with Naples and that Pontano's treatise was published in 1498 - the year of Carafa's official visit to that city.¹⁹ Coffin's hypothesis of Carafa's familiarity with this treatise is made the more compelling by the fact that its original dedicatee was Benedetto Gareth. This Spanish poet, more commonly known as Chariteo, was, at the time of Pontano writing this treatise, state secretary to the King of Naples. As a poet, however, he also wrote a laudatory poem in honour of Oliviero Carafa, 'Cardinal of Naples' in which he makes specific reference to Carafa's Neapolitan chapel of the Succorpo.²⁰ Once again one is presented with an example of that close-knit circle of humanist courtiers who surrounded Carafa and whose ideas provided a form of graceful endorsement for his princely mode of life and patronage of art. Indeed, the description that Pontano gives in the last chapter of his treatise, entitled 'on gardens and villas',²⁰ provides an insight into the kind of elegant environment that Carafa's villa and garden on the Quirinal must once have presented to the world at large.

The notion that such humanist ideas inspired by classical ethics informed Carafa's mecenatismo is all the more persuasive when one reconsiders Carafa's manifest interest in, and sponsorship of, certain kinds of humanist endeavour. As remarked upon in chapter one, the Renaissance programme of Rome's urban renewal drew its inspiration from the city's imperial past. Moreover, the restoration of Rome was interpreted as a symbol of the renewal of the Roman Church. That Carafa shared in such an ideology can be deduced from his restoration of the city's most revered and ancient churches, and from his building of

new ecclesiastical foundations and a villa suburbana recalling those of Rome's classical past. Moreover, in at least one painting originated by him, by juxtaposing the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius at San Giovanni Laterano and the departure point for Carafa's crusade against the infidel Turk (Pls. 21, 69, 71), pictorial allusion is made to Rome's imperial heritage and to the Church's continuation of that imperial mission.

Carafa also participated in the humanist rediscovery of classical epideictic oratory which, as O'Malley has demonstrated,²¹ became fundamental to the intellectual character of the Roman Renaissance. number of close associates and protégés were authors of the series of papal sermons which provide the most compelling instances of the use of this branch of rhetoric. Carafa himself was in all probability the instigator of another group of such rhetorical set pieces - the panegyrics composed in honour of Saint Thomas Aquinas which were performed at the Minerva on the saint's feast day (an event which in itself was promoted by Carafa). As discussed in chapter three, these sermons display many of the characteristics of epideictic oratory. Like the papal sermons, and often written by the same authors, they were not used as vehicles for expressing new ideas but rather to convey long-established moral truths.²² Thus the panegyrist would urge his audience to gaze upon, admire and wonder at familiar ideas skilfully summed up and evoked by his words. This fundamentally dogmatic and conservative intent would have been in tune with Carafa's impeccably orthodox views.

Carafa also patronised Greek scholarship, as demonstrated by the pieces translated at his behest by Brenta, Donato and Filelfo. While certain of these translations derive from classical authors, a substantial amount belong to the Greek patristic tradition. Carafa's sympathy for the Greek and Latin Fathers, and by implication for their definition and explication of the central mysteries of the Christian faith, can be deduced from a number of different sources - his ownership of Lactantius' Divinae Institutiones, Brenta's translation of John Chrysostom, the presentation copy of Basil's Sermo contra ebrios, and by extension the iconography of The Sibyls and The Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas (Pls. 19, 21). As argued in some detail in chapters three and four, one possible reason why Carafa took such an interest in patristic scholarship may have been its emphasis on the Incarnation and the Redemption - theological mysteries which supply a rationale for the mural programme of his chapel in the Minerva.

On a more general level, Carafa appears to have participated in another intellectual current prevalent in Rome at that time, whose adherents sought to accommodate classical and Christian learning into one harmonious scheme. For example, Carafa's decision to include representations of four pagan sibyls in his chapel scheme was endorsed both in the acknowledgement of the sibyls' authority by Lactantius and in a recently published Dominican treatise, Filippo Barbieri's Discordantiae Sanctorum Doctorum Hieronymi et Augustini. Thus Carafa's informed interest in antiquity was mediated and made more palatable by orthodox ecclesiastical scholarship, and utilised in the service of a conventional genre of Christian art.

Other ostensibly pagan motifs were included within the Christian context of his chapel foundations. Thus he approved the depiction of pagan artefacts and rites within the painted framework of the Minerva chapel scheme (Pls. 75, 77, 78) and the re-evocation of antique decorative scheme within the adjacent tomb chamber (Pl. 23). A similar range of self-consciously antique motifs appears within the cast and carved embellishment of the Succorpo (Pls. 90-95, 97). As such, these eye-catching allusions to ancient religious cults and rituals provide further compelling evidence of a humanistically inspired programme dedicated to finding an accommodation between ancient pagan religions and Christianity.

Carafa and his varied activities as a patron provide an excellent example of the continuity of Renaissance patronage. Such a tradition, already inheriting certain characteristics from the patronage system of republican Rome, became, in the fifteenth century, even more self-consciously classical in its style and modes of behaviour. Carafa's evident partisan loyalty to his gens and his home town can be traced to the present day Mediterranean culture. A striking instance of this sort of continuity occurs in the preservation of ius patronatus of the chapel of the Succorpo remaining with Carafa's descendents until 1964. Notwithstanding this strong sense of tradition and continuity, there is a historical specificity about the style of Carafa's patronage. His successful attempts to establish a clerical dynasty within his family belong to a social development which gained in momentum in the mid-fifteenth century when Italian families increasingly saw the future fortunes of their clan being bound up with the status and wealth of the

Church. His interest in reform of the Catholic Church and his inability to reconcile the conflicting demands of such reform, particularly in its fiscal form, with his obligations towards relatives, friends and clients, sum up the dilemma of the cardinalate on the eve of the Reformation.

His patronage of art and letters and the genres in which such patronage found its outlet, can be traced back to many of his cardinal predecessors. Yet it too reflected a distinctively Roman Renaissance culture to which he had privileged access. What is so striking about the projects which Carafa originated is that they are so self-consciously classical in their form and content and yet, as the reconstruction of the historical circumstances that engendered them shows, their all'antica style was grounded in Christian scholarship based on an amalgam of humanist and scholastic traditions. Thus this study provides in the last analysis a notable corrective to the assumption that there was a strongly polarised dichotomy between 'pagan' and 'Christian' features in late fifteenth-century Renaissance culture and that humanism had a greater impact and influence than scholasticism upon it. As the surviving evidence for the cultural patronage of an impeccably orthodox ecclesiastic like Oliviero Carafa shows, such manifestations were closely intertwined and received succour and inspiration one from the other.

Notes to Chapter 8

¹See above, chapter 1, p. 2.

²See above, chapter 1, p. 8.

³Brenta, In pentecosten oratio, fol. [1v]: 'Tua q[ue]l preserrtim causa ut haberes q[uod]l animum in te nostrum testaretur quodq[ue]l humanissimo doctissimoq[ue]l patrono expensum a cliente'.

⁴See above, chapter 3, pp. 107-9.

⁵See above, chapter 1, pp. 6-7.

⁶W. Reinhard, 'Nepotismus: der Funktionswandel einer papstgeschichtlichen Konstanten', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LXXXVI (1975), pp. 145-185, esp. pp. 176-7; 'Papa Pius: Prolegomena zu einer Sozialgeschichte des Papsttums', in Von Konstanz nach Trent: Festgabe für August Franzen ed. R. Bäumer (Paderborn, 1972), pp. 261-299, esp. pp. 296-7.

⁷Hay, The Church in Italy, pp. 34-5; Hallman, Italian cardinals, pp. 110-126.

⁸Hallman, ibid., p. 168.

⁹Cortesi, De cardinalatu, provides a convincing demonstration of the ambiguities and limits of reform thought at that time. Although he addresses such topics as simony (Lib. III, cap. VIII) nepotism (indirectly in his discussion of papal and cardinal elections, Lib. III, cap. IV, cap. IX) cardinals' power of censorship against a corrupt pope (cap. XI) and conciliar issues (cap. XII) his ideas for reform are largely rhetorical and further inhibited by his evident respect for tradition and maintenance of the status quo. In place of institutional reform of the Curia and cardinalate body he relies instead on the kinds of spiritual, charitable and cultural activities outlined by Hallman (see his recommendations in Lib. II, cap. XI, Lib. III, cap. X).

¹⁰De Totis, Oratio in funere Ludovici de Ferraria, fols. 3r/v, 4v.

¹¹For Cardinal Stefaneschi and his cultural patronage, see I. Hösl, Kardinal Jakobus Galetani Stefaneschi: ein Beitrag zur Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des beginnenden vierzehnten Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1908); A. Frugoni, Il cardinale Jacopo Stefaneschi biografo di Celestino V (Rome, 1954), esp. pp. 69-124; J. Gardner, 'The Stefaneschi altarpiece; a reconsideration', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXVII (1974), pp. 57-103, esp. pp. 57-8, 60-1, 63, 67-71; for Cardinal Niccolò Capocci, see the entry by B. Guillemain in DBI, Vol. XVIII (1975), pp. 600-3; L. Bonazzi, Storia di Perugia dalle origini al 1860 (Città di Castello, 1959), I, pp. 480-1; for Cardinal Rinaldo Brancaccio, see the entry by D. Girgensohn in DBI, Vol. XIII (1971), pp. 797-99; Lightbown, Donatello and Michelozzo, I, pp. 52-82, pp. 83-127 passim; for Cardinal Branda da Castiglione, see the entry by

Girgensohn in DBI, Vol. XXII (1979), pp. 69-75; A. Dallaj, Masolino da Panicale: le storie di Maria e del Battista a Castiglione Olona (Milan, 1986) *passim*.

¹²De Totis, Oratio in funere Lodovici de Ferraria, fol. 3^v. See also above, chapter 3, note 51.

¹³The relevant passage on magnificence appears in Ludovico da Ferrara, 'Compendium Ethicorum Aristotelis', fols. 26^v-27^r. No doubt the author's and Carafa's interest in the moral precepts of expenditure (as set out by Aristotle in the Nicomachean Ethics) was fuelled by Saint Thomas Aquinas' treatment of magnificentia in the Summa Theologica, II, ii, 134, 1-4 (Eng. trans. Vol. XII, pp. 293-301). Cortesius, De cardinalitu, Lib. I, cap. I, fol. 9^r, places magnificentia in the category of 'De virtutibus moralibus'. This admiration for and emulation of the ancient virtue of magnificence found its chief form of expression in the Renaissance in the patronage of architecture. See Fraser Jenkins, 'Cosimo de' Medici's patronage of architecture and theory of magnificence', *passim*; R. Goldthwaite, 'The empire of things: consumer demand in Renaissance Italy', Patronage, art and society, p. 166.

¹⁴Aristotle, The Nicomachean Ethics, trans. H. Rackham (new ed., London, 1962), IV, ii (5-16) pp. 207-11.

¹⁵G. Pontano, I trattati delle virtù sociali, ed. F. Tateo (Rome, 1965). The five treatises are entitled respectively: 'De liberalitate', 'De beneficentia', 'De magnificentia', 'De splendore', 'De conviventia'.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 'De magnificentia', p. 101, where Pontano cites Cosimo de' Medici as an exemplum: 'Aetate nostra Cosmus Florentinus imitatus est priscam magnificentiam tum in condendis templis ac villis, tum in bybliothecis faciendis; nec solum imitatus, sed, ut mihi videtur, is primus revocavit morem convertendi privatis divitias ad publicam bonum atque ad patriae ornamentum, quem non pauci, quanquam minore in re constituti imitari student'.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 'De splendore', p. 126.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, prologue to 'De splendore', p. 125; Coffin, 'The "lex hortorum" and access to gardens', pp. 201-232.

¹⁹For the bibliography on Benedetto Chariteo and his participation in the Accademia Pontaniana, see Cozenza, Italian humanists, II, p. 981. For his poem in praise of Carafa, see Le rime di Benedetto Gareth detto il Chariteo, ed. E. Percopo (Naples, 1892), p. 256. The verses where the poet refers to the Succorpo are published in Strazzullo, Saggi sul Duomo di Napoli, pp. 105-6.

²⁰Pontano, 'De splendore', ch. VIII, 'De hortis ac villis', pp. 136-8.

²¹O'Malley, Praise and blame, *passim*.

²²As remarked by O'Malley, 'Renaissance panegyrics', p. 192: 'it was considerably less important to say something historically accurate about Thomas' achievements than it was to fulfill the rhetorical intent of saying something relevant to the needs and concerns of their [the humanists] listeners'.

TABLE I

The genealogy of the male side of Oliviero Carafa's 'immediate' family

Antonio 'Malizia'
active 1384 d. 1437

Francesco (2nd son)
1412-1496

Carlo	Oliviero	Alessandro	Ettore	Fabrizio		
Count of Airola and Montesarchio active 1454 d.1515	Cardinal and Archbishop of Naples 1430-1511	Archbishop of Naples 1430-1503	Count of Ruvo d.1515			
					Antonio	Giacomo
					Count of	1482-1524
					Ruvo	
					1471-1522	
						Vincenzo
						Archbisho
						of Naples
						active
						1497
						d.1540

TABLE II

The genealogy of the Carafa family to demonstrate Oliviero Carafa's relationship to Diomede Carafa, Paul IV and Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola

Antonio 'Malizia'

Diomede (7th son)
Count of Maddaloni
active 1422 d.1487

Giovanni Antonio (1st son)
Count of Montorio

Giovanni Tommaso

Paul IV
1476-1559

Maria

Giovanna = Gianfrancesco
Pico della
Mirandola

TABLE III

Oliviero Carafa's benefices

1437	Canon of the Duomo of Naples
1458, 18 Nov.	Archbishop of Naples
1467, 18 Sept.	Cardinal Presbyter of SS. Pietro e Marcellino
1470, 5 Sept.	Cardinal Presbyter of S. Eusebio
1476, 24 July	Cardinal Bishop of Albano
1477-8	Chamberlain of the Sacred College
1479	<u>Commenda</u> of the church of S. Nicola del Casale, near Otranto
1483, 31 Jan.	Cardinal Bishop of Sabina
1485, 19 Oct.	Commendatory abbot of the abbeys of Cava dei Tirreni and Montevergine
1486-88	Ceded benefice of Badia of S. Benedetto, Bari, to Stefano Fanello, his auditor.
1491, 16 Sept.	See of Salamanca
1496, 4 Sept.	Apostolic Administrator of the diocese of Rimini; renounced in favour of his nephew, Vincenzo. When the latter was nominated Archbishop of Naples in 1505, the position returned to Oliviero Carafa, who held it until his death (1511).
1497, 14 April	Renounced the title of Abbot of Cava dei Tirreni in order to unit the abbey with S. Giustina in Padua.
1498, 28 Mar.	Monastery of Pulsano (Manfredonia) which he then ceded to his relative, Giacomo Tocco.

- 1499, 2 Feb. Obtained the commenda of the archbishopric of Chieti, which he resigned cum regressu on 20 December, 1501, in favour of his relative, Bernardino Carafa. Received the commenda of the see of Caiazzo.
- 1500 Obtained the commenda of the Badia of S. Aniello del Vulture, which he resigned in the same year in favour of his relative, Giovanni Francesco, but reserved part of the stipend.
- 1501 Renounced the archbishopric of Chieti in favour of Bernardino Carafa.
- 1503, 7 Aug. Took possession of the archbishopric of Naples on the death of Alessandro Carafa. On 29 November, became Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and Dean of the Sacred College.
- 1505 Renounced archbishopric of Naples in favour of Bernardino Carafa, and recovered archbishopric of Chieti. On Bernardino's death, in May, ceded Chieti to Gian Pietro Caraa (future Paul IV). Vincenzo promoted to archbishopric of Naples while Oliviero Carafa recovered Rimini. Obtained commenda of Gerace and of Oppido which he renounced in the same year.
- 1507 Renounced see of Caiazzo.
- 1510, 24 April Apostolic Administrator for the see of Tricarico.

To these benefices should be added at an unknown date the additional benefice of San Sepolchro de Cotayud, Spain, and the commenda of the abbey of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Rome.

TABLE IV

The position and identities of the figures on the Succorpo ceiling

SAINT AUGUSTINE	SAINT JOHN THE EVANGELIST	SAINT GREGORY
SAINT LUKE	THE MADONNA AND CHRIST CHILD	SAINT MATTHEW
SAINT PAUL	SAINT MARK	SAINT PETER
SAINT ATHANASIUS	SAINT JANUARIUS	SAINT ASPRENUS
SAINT EUSEBIUS	SAINT SEVERUS	SAINT AGRIPPINUS
SAINT JEROME	SAINT AGNELLUS	SAINT AMBROSE

•
r

22

- 1

- 1473 Feb. 4. [1472, old style of dating] Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Cardinal of Sant'Eusebio (MAP XLVI no. 154).
- 1476 Aug. 9. Narni. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Albano, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 49).
- 1476 Nov. 19. Naples. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Albano, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 481).
- 1477 Nov. 10. Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Albano, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XXIV no. 478).
- 1488 Mar. 26. Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP LXVI no. 197).
- 1488 Apr. 6. Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP LXVI no. 198, published in de Maio, Savonarola, Appendix I, p. 182).
- 1488 Sept. 2. Rome. To Gabrieli, Abbot of Monte Scalaro, from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 556, see Appendix II).
- 1489 Feb. 14. [1488, old style of dating] Florence. To the Cardinal of Naples from Lorenzo de' Medici (MAP LI no. 451).
Another undated draft (MAP LVIII no 64).
- 1489 June 5. Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLI no. 147).
- 1491 Jan. 1. [1490, old style dating] Rome. To Lorenzo de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLI no. 427).
- 1492 Apr. 11. Rome. To Piero de' Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XV no. 15).

- 1492 July 20. Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 562).
- 1492 Sept. 22. Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP LX no. 323).
- 1493 July 5. Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 569, published in de Maio, Savonarola, Appendix II, p.181).
- 1493 Aug. 25. Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 570).
- 1493 Sept. 14. Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 572, published in de Maio, Savonarola, Appendix II, p.182).
- 1494 Mar. 5. [1493, old style of dating] Copy of a letter to the Cardinal of Naples from Dionigi Pucci (MAP LV no. 158).
- 1495 Feb. 3. [1494, old style of dating] Rome. To Piero de'Medici from Oliviero, Bishop of Sabina, Cardinal of Naples (MAP XLVI no. 578).

APPENDIX II

Letter from Cardinal Carafa to Abbot Gabrieli Mazzinghi (dated 2 September, 1488).

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Archivio Mediceo avanti il principato, XLVI no. 556. Published in E. Müntz, Archivio storico dell'arte, II, 1889, p. 484; A. Scharf, Filippino Lippi, Vienna, 1935, p. 89. Doc. 9; in trans., D. S. Chambers, Artists and Patrons in the Italian Renaissance, Columbia, 1971, pp. 22-3. The following transcription is made from the original letter in the Archivio di Stato, Florence.

Ven[erabilis] abbas n[ost]r. Hogi a xx hore, haviamo donato
l[ettere], et lice[n]tia a m[ae]str[o] philippo n[ost]ro, con el quale
havemo concluso e contractato l'opera, come ala, tornata sua
intenderite: q[ua]l[n]do con piacer[el], una cu[m] M[agnifico] Oratore,
legimo, la ve[stra] de XXVI del passato piena de dubio, che m[ae]str[o]
philippo n[ost]ro car[issim]o no[n] fusse da sui emuli supplantato:
presso noi. Sed modice fidei, q[ua]l[n]do dubitasti. Ben posseva la
p[aternita] v[ost]ra pensare, q[ua]l[n]do ben m[ae]str[o] philippo mai
fusse stato de quella sufficienza, chel e, che e[ssendo] dal M[agnifico]
Lo[renzo] commendato, lo haveriamo preposto ad uno Apelle, ov[er]lo a
tutta Italia. Vero e che in quel giorno che gionse in Roma, ne fu
f[al]c[t]a practica p[er] un chel venia de costi. Noi, ben che, ancora
no[n] haveamo visto m[ae]str[o] philipp[o]; tam[en] p[er] manegioera tra
noi, no[n] li doniamo orecchie. Poi de li poca hora, ce lo meno
m[ess]er Jo[vanni] Antonio v[ost]ro: e volu[n]tieri, leto an[im]o, el

vidimo: et semp[re] stato press[ol] noi: et concluso l'op[er]a con lui.
Et hora vene, p[er] tornar[el] presto in ordine. Da lui intenderite omni
cosa. Solo ve dicimo, che essendone stato indirizzato, dal M[agnifil]co
Lo[renzo] haveriamo cambiato, p[er] qu[an]ti altri pictori forono mai in
Grecia antiqua. Cetera remettino a le l[et]tere chel p[re]det[to]
m[ae]stro philippo porta. Bene valeat p[ate]r v[ester] et mai non
desista regratiare ne el M[agnifil]co Lo[renzo] quale da no[stra] p[ar]te
milies salutarete.

APPENDIX III

Oration composed by Oliviero Carafa in honour of Ferrante of Naples

Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo Laurenziana, cod. laur. plut. LXXX, sup.
46, Antonio Beccadelli, 'Quintum epistolorum volumen', fols. 78^rv.

Note: In this transcription the matter in brackets indicates where abbreviations have been introduced. Very occasionally a vowel has been corrected so as to render a word more comprehensible.

Reverendissimi Domini Oliverii Cardinali Neapolitani.

Oratio in Serenissimum Ferdinandum Regem Illustrissimum.

Si gratus & beneficiorum memor videri velim magnamine Rex: non potui non dolere graviter: & iniquo animo ferre. Luctuosum atque acerbum interitum, amplissimi & potentissimi quondam Regis parentis tui, cum eius in patriam caritatem singularem: aequissimum imperium et humanissimam administrationem: atque in omnes hominum, genus munificentissimam largitatem mecum ipse cogitationem, quanquam quis tam duro tam ferreo pectore tam inhumano ingenio inveniri possit: qui non illius memoriam dulcissima recordatione prosequatur. Qui talis ac tanta principis indignissimum obitum non egrégile ferat. Cuius res pace belloque clarissimae gestae, universum orbem complexae sunt quidem si fieri potuisset: immortalem esse oportebat. Mihi tamen praeter caeteros iustis simulatque dolendi causa fuit cum omni familiae nostrae ita semper fautor extiterit. Ut eum velut deum quendam in

nostrae ita semper fautor extiterit. Ut eum velut deum quendam in terris haberemus. Sed amarissimum dolorem meum quem ex illius morte suscepi haec una res consolaturer mitigat quod te tanta probitate ac mansuetudine praeditum successisse video qui paternarum virtutum aemulator atque imitator non solum eius res gestas ac quibus verum etiam facile superabis ut Telamonem Ajax ut Pellea vicit Achilles. Quippe magnitudine animi tui gravitatem constantiam inauditamque prudentiam & res militaris peritiam: caeterasque virtutes non ignoro: quibus opinioni quam de te iam puero cives conceperant, mirifice respondebis. Maximo vero recreatur, atque incredibiliter reffectus sum, hoc tuo erga me recentissimo beneficio, quo me nuper etiam absentem ornandum putasti. Quod mihi tanquam monumentum & pignus, quondam summi erga me, meosque omnes amoris tui esse voluisti. Pro quo quidem merito singulari gratias tibi ut debeo ago immortales. Quas si referre non potero tantas tamen me habiturum, polliceor quantas maximas capere poterit animus meus. Teque benefactorem meum non modo nunc sed in omne futurum tempus profiteri ac praedicare non definiam. Dum mihi vita superit & spiritus hos reget artus. Bene vale.

APPENDIX IV

Rome, Archivio di Canonici Regolari Lateranensi di S. Pietro in Vincoli, fondo S. Maria della Pace (E no. 39). Published by C. Ricci, Nuova Antologia, I (1915), pp. 361-7.

Sia noto a caduna persona che legera la presente scriptura como maestro Bartolomeo de Francesco de Antonio habitatore de presente ne la regione di S. Eustachio in piazza de'Cavalieri scalpellino s'è convenuto et à promisso a dono d. Jacobo da Cremona preposito di S. Maria de la Pace in nome del dicto convento de lavorare et perficere octo colone quadre de travertino de altezza de palmi 15 et più palmi 6 cum soi capitelli bassi idest zenico de largheza de palmi 2 per colona et pilastro bene conducte et lavorate cum quattro legature per colona in tuto e per tuto secundo la forma del disegno restato in mano de maestro Bramante architectore. Le quale sian laudate et a piacimento de dicto maestro Bramante: et conducte su la opera se à affare in dicto monasterio per tutto el mese de septembrio proximo futuro et tuto el lavorerio tivertino et altre cosse predicta a tute spese del prefato maestro Bartolomeo: al quale per pretio et mercato de dicte colone et pilastri el prefato preposito nomine dicti monasterii à promesso pagare et expursare ducati octo di carlini per caduna colona et pilastro lavorati al modo et secundo lo iudicio ut supra: el quale preposito sua liberalitate à promisso che finite dicte opere et pilastri in caso che dicti pilastri et lavoro siano reducti a satisfacione del dicto maestro Bramante de donare al dicto maestro Bartholomeo da ducati tri in giuso tuto quello iudicarario

maistro Bramante. Et in fede de tute le cosse predicte è stata facta la presente scripta de voluntade de le parte predicte. In presentia del prefato maistro Bramante, maistro Dominico de Paulo da Roma scalpelino et maistro Carlo da Bressa fabricatore. Anno d[omi]ni 1500 die 17 augusti.

Die XXV augusti 1500

In nomine Domini amen. In praesentia mei notarii etc. constitutus magister Bartholomeus Francisci de Fesulis florentinae dioceseos retrospectus sponte etc. confessus fuit habuisse et recepisse et ita habuit et recepit in praesentia mei notarii ducatos viginti ad rationem X carlenorum pro ducato pro parte solutionis columnarum et operum retrospectorum per eum promissorum in retrospecti cedula a veni.¹ et religioso viro Jo. Jacobo de Cremona ad praesens praeposito ecclesiae et monasterii beatae Mariae de Pace praesente [sic] etc; post quam quidem professionem se bene quietum contentum vocavit, etc. Et insuper ad praesens, ad requisitionem dicti magistri Bartholomei, honorabilis vir magister Andreas Masi florentinus scarpellinus de regione S. Eustachii sponte fideiussit et se principaliter obligavit dicto fratri. Jo. Jacobo praeposito praesenti quod praefatus magister Bartholomeus adimplebit omnia et singula per eum promissa in retrospecti cedula, alias teneri voluit ut principalis etc. Pro quibus dicti Bartholomeus et Andreas obligaverunt in pleniore forma Camerae etc.

Actum in dicta ecclesiae Sanctae Mariae de Pace praesentibus Jacomino filio Henrici de Caesaris de Villalada Bergomensis dioceseas sutore in platea S. Mariae rotundae et Bartholomeo filio Michaelis de Cerchiara dictae dioceseos textibus.

Ita est ego Jo. Bapt.^{us} Paluzelli de Rubeis notarius de praemissis rogatus m.^{us} p.^{us}.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript sources

Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum

Marlay 10: missal commissioned for Oliviero Carafa.

Chicago, Newberry Library

MS 99.1: Ludovicus de Ferraria, 'Compendium Ethicorum Aristotelis', abridgement of Aristotles' Nicomachean Ethics by Ludovico da Ferrara.

Florence, Archivio di Stato

Archivio Mediceo avanti il principato: letters from Oliviero Carafa to Lorenzo de'Medici and Piero de'Medici; letters to Oliviero Carafa from Lorenzo de'Medici and Dionogi Pucci (see Appendix I).

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana

Cod. Laur. Plut. LXXXX Sup. 46: Antonio Beccadelli, 'Quintum epistolarum volumen ad Oliverium Archiepiscopum Neapolitanum', diplomatic epistles and orations by Panormita.

London, British Library

Add. MS 8443: Paris de Grassis. 'Diarium', record of papal ceremonies compiled by Paris de Grassis.

Henry Davis Collection, M 48: 'Epistola ad Theodosium Judeorum principem, et eiusdem Theodosii responsio ad eundem Philippum', excerpt from Suidas, translated by Filelfo for Pietro Balbi and Theodore of Gaza.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale

Fondo brancacciano, V, A, 12: Bernardino Siciliano, 'De vita gestis ac miraculis Januarii', life of Saint Januarius by Fra Bernardo Siciliano.

Fondo S. Martino, MS 444: notarial records of Nicola d'Afelro relating to the sale of Carafa property in Naples.

Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta

Fondo vecchio, G 102, fols. 3v-23r: Jacopus Sadoletus, 'Aristotelis ad Alexandrum de mundo liber', translation by Jacopo Sadoletto of Aristotles' letter to Alexander on the freedom of the world.

Rome, Archivio di Stato

Notari Capitolini, 499, fols. 21^v-22^r: notarial record of Andrea de Carusiis relating to Oliviero Carafa's acquisition of property in Rome.

Protocolli 5529, fols. 19^r-20^v: notarial records of Notar Pechinolo relating to Carafa property on the Quirinal.

Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale

MS Fondo Vitt. Em. 721, fol. 71^v: fifteenth-century description of Palazzo Orsini in Rome.

Rome, Biblioteca di San Clemente

Albericus de Rosate, 'Repertorium Iuris Canonici', Alberico de Rosate's digest of canon law.

Anonymous late fourteenth-century commentary on the Decretals.

Antonius de Butrio, 'In quintum librum Decretalium', Antonio de Butrio's commentaries on the fifth book of the Decretals, presentation copy for Oliviero Carafa.

Dominicus de Sancto Geminiano, 'Recollecte super libris 3, 4, et 5 Sexti Libri Decretalium', Domenico di San Gimignano's selected commentaries on the Sext, presentation copy for Oliviero Carafa.

Guillelmus de Horborch et. al., 'Decisiones Rotae Romanae', collection of promulgations by the Roman Rota.

Johannes de Turrecremata, 'Commentarium in Decretum Gratiani, Causae 1-5, Juan Torquemada's commentaries on the Decretum of Gratian.

Johannes de Turrecremata, 'Commentarium in Decretum Gratiani, Causae 6-16, Juan Torquemada's commentaries on the Decretum of Gratian.

Firmianus Lactantius, 'Divinae Institutiones', Lactantius' Divine Institutes, transcribed by Thomas Cantacuzene.

Legal notebook of Bartholomeus de Benevento, miscellaneous collection of decisions made by fourteenth-century Italian jurists.

Nicolaus de Collicorvino, 'Corvina super Decretum', Niccolò de Collicorvino's commentaries on the Decretum.

'Varia', collection of extracts from the writings of fourteenth-century Italian jurists.

Rome, Santa Sabina, Archivio Generale, O.P.

Prov. Regni IV, 3, fols. 72^r, 77^r: record of Oliviero Carafa's judgement in a case in the south Italian Dominican province.

Reg. Torr. 9, fols. 77^v, 86^v: directives by Master General Jacopo Torriani relating to Oliviero Carafa's powers of jurisdiction.

Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano

Intr., et. Ex., Reg. 487, fol. 171^v: cameral accounts relating to Oliviero Carafa's 1472 naval expedition against the Turks.

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana,

MSS Chigiani I, V, 167: 'Inscriptiones et epitaphia', late sixteenth-century collection of inscriptions and epitaphs.

Ottob. lat. 1938: Pietro Ursuleo, 'Olivierii Cardinalis Neapolitani itinerarium classis apostolicae in Turcos', Pietro Ursuleo's account of Oliviero Carafa's expedition against the Turks.

Ottob. lat. 2011: Francesco Maturanzio, 'Carmina', poems of Francesco Maturanzio.

Vat. lat. 2870: Antonio Flaminio, 'Carmina', poems of Antonio Flaminio.

Vat. lat. 3463: Girolamo Donati, 'De principatu Romanae sedis ad Graecos', defence of the Roman church by Girolamo Donati.

Vat. lat. 3465: Antonio Pucci, 'Oratio de laudibus divi Thomae Aquinatis in templo divae Mariae Minervae Romae ad patres et populum habita nonis martiis', oration to Saint Thomas Aquinas by Antonio Pucci.

Vat. lat. 3551: Andrea Brenta, 'Caii Julii Caesaris oratio Belgicae ad milites habita', miscellany of epistles and orations scribed by Andrea Brenta including his translation of Dio Cassius' record, in Greek, of Julius Caesar's Oratio Belgica.

Vat. lat. 3611: Antonio Geraldini, 'Liber carminum', poems of Antonio Geraldini.

Vat. lat. 3681: Andrea Brenta, 'Hippocratis libellus de insomniis', translation of Hippocrates' On sleeplessness by Andrea Brenta.

Vat. lat. 3883: 'Propositiones et avisamenta pro reformatione', record of preparatory work of the 1497 papal reform commission.

Vat. lat. 3884: 'Reformationes', record of the recommendations of the 1497 papal reform commission.

Vat. lat. 5388, fols. 33^v-45^v: Francesco Maturanzio, 'Oratio habita Romae in aede divae Mariae in Minerva in laudem divi Thomae Aquinatis', oration to Saint Thomas Aquinas by Francesco Maturanzio.

Vat. lat. 5634, 5634 bis: Paris de Grassis, 'Caerimoniarium opusculum', record of the ceremonies of the papal court by Paris de Grassis.

Vat. lat. 5874: Benedetto Maffei, 'Epithoma in libros Plinii historie naturalis', abridgement of Pliny's Natural history by Benedetto Maffei.

Vat. lat. 6855: Andrea Brenta, 'Oratio funebris Lysiae; oratio in convivii laudem habita apud Cardinalem Oliverium Neapolitanum; oratio S. Joannis Chrysostomi in proditione Judae; lex medicinae Hippocratis', miscellany of orations and translation from the Greek by Andrea Brenta.

Printed primary sources

Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis Praedicatorum, edited by B. M. Reichart in Monumenta ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum historica, Rome, 1896-.

Acta Sanctorum, 69 vols., edited by J. B. Carnandet, Paris, 1863-.

Alberti, Leandro, De viris illustribus ordinis Praedicatorum, Bologna, 1517.

Alberti, Leon Battista, Ten books on architecture, translated into Italian by Cosimo Bartoli and into English by James Leoni, edited by J. Rykwert, London, 1955.

Albertini, Francesco, Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae, Rome, 1510; text of Opusculum de mirabilibus novae urbis Romae (only), edited by A. von Schmarsow, Heilbronn, 1886; facsimile reprint edited by P. Murray, Five early guides to Rome and Florence, London, 1972.

Antoninus, Summa theologica, Verona, 1740, reprint edited by I. Colosio, Graz, 1959.

Aquinas, Thomas, The "Summa theologica" of Saint Thomas Aquinas, 22 vols., translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, 2nd ed., London, 1920-32.

_____, Summa contra gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas, 4 vols., translated by the English Dominican Fathers, London, 1924.

_____, Summa philosophica. seu de veritate catholicae fidei contra gentiles, edited by J.F.B.M. de Rubeis, Paris, 1925.

Aristotle, The Nicomachean Ethics, translated by H. Rackham, new ed., London, 1962.

Augustine, De civitate Dei, edited by B. Dombart and A. Kalb in Opera (Corpus Christianorum), vol. XIV, 1-2), Turnholdt, 1955.

Barbieri, Filippo, Opuscula, Rome, 1481.

- Bernardino da Siena, Le prediche volgari di San Bernardino da Siena, dette nella Piazza del Campo l'anno MCCCCXXVII, 3 vols., edited by L. Banchi, Siena, 1880-88.
- Bertola, M., I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: Codici Vaticani latini 3964, 3966, Vatican, 1942.
- Bicchieri, Z., ed., Alcuni documenti artistici non mai stampati (1451-1565), Florence, 1855.
- Brandolini, Aurelio Lippo, Oratio pro Sancto Thoma Aquinate, Rome, 1485-90.
- _____, De natura hominis et alia opuscula, Rome, c. 1482-83.
- _____, In pentecosten oratio, Rome, after 1483.
- Burchardus, Johannes, Liber notarum, edited by E. Celano in Rerum Italicarum scriptores, 2nd ed., vol. XXXII, 1, Città di Castello, 1907.
- Cajetan [Tommaso de Viol], Commentaria in Isagogen Porphyrii ad Praedicamenta Aristotelii, Venice, 1505.
- _____, Additiones in libros posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis, Venice, 1506.
- _____, Commentaria super libros Aristotelis de anima, Rome, 1509.
- _____, editor, Summa sacrae theologiae, by Thomas Aquinas, 4 vols., Lyons, 1562.
- Carmina quae ad pasquillum fuerunt posita in anno MCCCCCIX, Rome, 1509.
- Carmina ad Pasquillum Herculem obtrucantem Hydram referentem posita anno MDX, Rome, 1510.
- Carmina ad Pasquillum posita MDXI, Rome, 1511.
- Conti, Sigismondo de', Le storie de'suoi tempi, dal 1475 al 1510, 2 vols., translated by D. Zanelli and F. Calabro and edited by G. Racioppi, Rome, 1883.
- Cortese, Paolo, De cardinalatu (in Castro Cortesio), 1510.
- _____, The Renaissance cardinal's ideal palace: a chapter from Cortesi's De cardinalatu, translated and edited by K. Weil-Garris and J. F. D'Amico, Rome, 1980.
- Egger, H., ed., Codex Escorialensis, ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios, 2 vols., Vienna, 1905-06.
- Filangieri, G., ed., Documenti per la storia, le arti e le industrie delle provincie napoletane, 6 vols., Naples, 1883-91.

Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis, edited by D. Prümmer and M. H. Laurent, Saint Maximin [Var], 1924-37.

Forcella, V., Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma, 14 vols. in 7, Rome, 1869-84.

Gherardi, Jacopo, Il diario romano, edited by E. Carusi in Rerum Italicarum scriptores, 2nd. ed., vol. XXIII, 3, Bologna, 1904-11.

Giacomo, Notaro, Cronica di Napoli, edited by P. Garzilli, Naples, 1845.

Giustiniani, Antonio, Dispacci di Antonio Giustinian, ambasciatore veneto in Roma dal 1502 al 1505, 3 vols., edited by P. Villari, Florence, 1876.

_____, Le due spedizioni militari di Giulio II, edited by L. Frati, Bologna, 1886.

Hollanda, Francisco de, Os desenhos das antigualhas que vio Francisco d'Ollanda, pintor português 1539-1540, edited by E. Tormo, Madrid, 1940.

Hülßen, C., ed., Il libro di Giuliano Sangallo. Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1910.

_____, and H. Egger, eds., Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck, 2 vols., Berlin, 1913-16.

Infessura, Stefano, Diario della città di Roma, edited by D. Tommasini, Rome, 1890.

Inghirami, Tommaso 'Fedra', Panegyricus in memoriam divi Thomae Aquinatis, Rome, c. 1495, 1500.

Lactantius, The Divine Institutes, translated by M. F. McDonald, The Fathers of the Church, 49, Washington, D.C., 1964.

Ludovico da Ferrara, Sermones quinque coram Pontifice Maximo habiti, Rome, c. 1493-6.

Maffei, Benedetto, De laudibus pacis oratio, Rome, c. 1483.

Mariano, da Firenze, Itinerarium urbis Romae, edited by E. Bulletti, Rome, 1931.

Mazzocchi, Jacopo, Epigrammata antiquae urbis, Rome, 1521.

Migne, J. P., ed., Patrologiae cursus completus, 221 vols., Series Latina, Paris, 1844-64, Supplementum, Paris, 1958-74.

Mongelli, G., ed., Abbazia di Montevergine. Regesto delle pergamene (Pubblicazione degli archivi di stato), 33, Rome, 1958.

Monumenta ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum historica, edited by B. M. Reichart, Rome-Stuttgart, 1896-.

Muratori, L.A., ed., Rerum Italicarum scriptores, n.ed., Città di Castello, Bologna, 1900-.

Paschini, P., ed., Il carteggio fra il cardinale Marco Barbo e Giovanni Lorenzi (1481-1490), Studi e testi, 137, Città del Vaticano, 1948.

Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento, 2 vols., edited by V. Marucci, A. Marzo and A. Romano, Rome, 1983.

Pasquino. Cinquecento pasquinate, edited by R. and F. Silenzi, Milan, 1932.

Passero, Giuliano, Giornali, edited by V. M. Altobelli, Naples, 1785.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni, Opera omnia, 2 vols., Basle, 1572-3.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni Francesco, editor, Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem, 2 vols., edited by E. Garin, Florence, 1946-52.

Pontano, Giovanni, I trattati delle virtù sociali, edited by F. Tateo, Rome, 1965.

Sadoletto, Jacopo, De bello suscipiendo contra Turcos, Rome, c. 1510.

Sanuto, Marino, I diarii, edited by R. Fulin, 58 vols., Venice, 1879-1903.

Summonte, Pietro, L'arte napoletana del Rinascimento . . . la lettera di P. Summonte a M.A. Michiel, edited by F. Nicolini, Naples, 1925.

Tedallini, Sebastiano, Diario della città di Roma, edited by P. Piccolomini in Rerum Scriptores Italicarum, 2nd, ed., vol. XXIII, 3, Città del Castello, 1904.

Torquemada, Juan de, Johannes de Turrecremata Meditationes, Rome, 1467.

Totis, Timoteo de, Oratio in funere Ludovici de Ferraria, Rome, after Sept., 1496.

Tumulillis, Angelo de, Notabilia temporum, edited by C. Corvisieri, Livorno, 1890.

Vasari, Giorgio, Le vite de più eccellenti architetti, pittori et scultori italiani, Florence, 1550.

_____, Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori, 9 vols., edited by G. Milanesi, Florence, 1878-85.

Viana, Martino de, Oratio . . . in festo divi Thomae de Aquino, Rome, after 7 Mar., 1496.

Vida, Marco Girolamo, Epicedion in funere Reverendi domini domini Oliverii Carafae neapolitani cardinalis episcopi hostiensis, Rome, 1511.

Volpicella, L., ed., Regis Ferdinandi Primi instructionem liber (10 maggio 1486-10 maggio 1488, Naples, 1916.

Secondary sources

Abbate, F., 'Le sculture del "Succorpo" di San Gennaro e i rapporti Napoli Roma tra Quattro Cinquecento', Bollettino d'arte, XI (1981), pp. 89-109.

Ackerman, J.S., 'Marcus Aurelius on the Capitoline Hill', Renaissance News, X (1957), pp. 69-75.

Adinolfi, P., Roma nell'età di mezzo., 2 vols., Rome, 1881.

Alberigo, G., Cardinalato e collegialità: studi sull'ecclesiologia tra l'XI e il XVI secolo, Florence, 1969.

Aldimari, B., Historia genealogica della famiglia Carafa, 3 vols., Naples, 1691.

Altamura, A., 'Il cardinale Oliviero carafa in un'orazione inedita del Sadoletto', Rassegna storica napoletana, n.s. I (1940), pp. 317-25.

_____, L'umanesimo nel mezzogiorno d'Italia, Florence, 1941.

Ames-Lewis, F., Drawing in early Renaissance Italy, New Haven and London, 1981.

Angelis, P. de, L'architetto e gli affreschi di Santo Spirito in Saxia., Rome, 1961.

Antonovics, A. V., 'Counter Reformation cardinals: 1534-1590', European Studies Review, II (1972), pp. 301-28.

_____, 'The library of Cardinal Domenico Capranica', in Cultural aspects of the Italian Renaissance: essays in honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller, edited by C. H. Clough, pp. 141-159, Manchester, 1976.

Baxandall, M., Painting and experience in fifteenth century Italy, Oxford, 1972.

Bentley, J.H., Politics and culture in Renaissance Naples, Princeton, 1987.

Berenson, B., I disegni dei pittori fiorentini, 3 vols., revised, edited with N. Mariano and L. Vertova Nicolson, translated by L. Vertova Nicolson, Milan, 1961.

Bergström, I., 'Medicina, Fons et Scrinium: a study in Van Eyckean symbolism and its influence in Italian art', Konsthistorisk Tidskrift, XXVI (1957), pp. 1-20.

Bertelli, C., 'Filippino Lippi riscoperto', Il Veltra, VII (1963), pp. 55-65.

_____, 'Appunti sugli affreschi nella Cappella Carafa alla Minerva', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XXXV (1965), pp. 115-30.

_____, 'Il restauro della Cappella Carafa in S. Maria sopra Minerva a Roma', Bollettino dell'Istituto centrale del restauro, XLII (1965), pp. 145-95.

Berthier, J. J., L'église de la Minerve à Rome, Rome, 1910.

Berti, L., and U. Baldini, Filippino Lippi, Florence, 1957.

Bialostocki, J., 'The sea-thiasos in Renaissance sepulchral art', in Studies in Renaissance and Baroque art presented to Anthony Blunt on his 60th birthday, pp. 69-74, London and New York, 1967.

_____, 'The door of death: survival of a classical motif in sepulchral art', Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunstsammlungen, XVIII (1973), pp. 7-32.

Bignami-Odier, J., 'Des manuscrits de Prospero Podiani à la Bibliothèque Vaticane', Studi di bibliografia e di storia in onore di Tammaro de Marinis, vol. I, pp. 91-134, Verona, 1964.

Bober, P. Fray, Drawings after the antique by Amico Aspertini: sketchbooks in the British Museum, Studies of the Warburg Institute, vol. XXI, London, 1957.

_____, 'An antique sea-thiasos in the Renaissance', in Essays in memory of Karl Lehmann, pp. 43-48, edited by L. Freeman Sandler, New York, 1964.

_____, 'The Coryciana and the nymph Corycia', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XL (1977), pp. 223-239.

_____, and R. Rubinstein, with contributions by S. Woodford, Renaissance artists and antique sculpture: a handbook of sources, London, 1986.

Borrelli, G., 'Uno gruppo di maestri scultori nella cappella del Succorpo di San Gennaro nel Duomo', Asprenas, XI, 2-3 (1964), pp. 182-92.

Borsook, E., 'Documents for Filippo Strozzi's chapel in Santa Maria Novella and other related papers', Burlington Magazine, CXII (1970), pp. 737-45, 800-04.

_____, and J. Offerhaus, Francesco Sassetti and Ghirlandaio at Santa Trinita. Florence: history and legend in a Renaissance chapel, Doornspijk, 1981.

Boyle, L. E., 'Santa Maria della Pace and San Clemente, 1816-1846', San Clemente Miscellany I. The community of SS. Sisto e Clemente in Rome, 1677-1977, pp. 89-128, Rome, 1977.

- _____, 'Manuscripts and incunabula in the library of San Clemente', San Clemente Miscellany II. Art and archeology, pp. 152-178, edited by L. Dempsey, Rome, 1978.
- Brandi, C., 'The first version of Filippino Lippi's Assumption', Burlington Magazine, LXVII (1935), pp. 30-35.
- Bridgeman, J., 'Filippino Lippi's Nerli altar-piece - a new date', Burlington Magazine, CXXX (1988), pp. 668-71.
- Bruhns, L., 'Das Motiv der ewigen Anbetung in der römischen Grabplastik des 16, 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts', Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, IV (1940), pp. 253-426.
- Bruschi, A., Bramante architetto., Bari, 1969, rev. Eng. version, Bramante, London, 1973.
- Campana, A., 'The origin of the word "humanist"', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, IX (1946), pp. 60-73.
- Cannatà, R., et. al., Umanesimo e primo Rinascimento in S. Maria del Popolo, Roma, Rome, 1981.
- Canuti, F., Il Perugino., 2 vols., Siena, 1931.
- Caracciolo, A., De sacris Ecclesiae Neapolitanae monumentis, Naples, 1645.
- Cardella, L., Memorie storiche de' Cardinali della Santa Romana Chiesa, 9 vols., Rome, 1792-97.
- Carpaneto, M. G., 'Raffaellino del Garbo', Antichità viva, pt. I, IX (1970), no. 4, pp. 3-23; pt. II, X (1971), no. 1, pp. 3-19.
- Caserta, A., and G. Lambertini, Storia e scienza di fronte al miracolo di S. Gennaro, Naples, 1986.
- Catalini, L., I palazzi di Napoli, Naples, 1969.
- Catalogue of books printed in the XVth century now in the British Museum, 7 pts, London, 1908-1935, Supplement, 1985.
- Celano, C., Notizie del bello, dell'antico e del curioso della città di Napoli, 5 vols., edited by G. B. Chiarini, Naples, 1856-60.
- Celier, L., 'Alexandre VI e la réforme de l'église', Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, XXVII (1907), pp. 65-124.
- Chacón, A., Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S.R.E. cardinalium, 4 vols., Rome, 1677.
- Chambers, D. S., Cardinal Bainbridge in the court of Rome, 1509-1514, Oxford, 1965.

- _____, 'The economic predicament of Renaissance cardinals', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, III (1966), pp. 289-313.
- _____, Patrons and artists in the Italian Renaissance, London, 1970.
- _____, 'The housing problems of Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXIX (1976), pp. 21-58.
- _____, 'Studium Urbis and Gabella Studii: the University of Rome in the fifteenth century', in Cultural aspects of the Italian Renaissance: essays in honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller, pp. 68-110, edited by C. H. Clough, Manchester, 1976.
- Chioccarello, B., Antistitum praeclarissimae neapolitanae ecclesiae catalogus, Naples, 1643.
- Coffin, D., The villa in the life of Renaissance Rome, Princeton monographs in art and archaeology, vol. 34, Princeton, 1979.
- _____, 'The "lex hortorum" and access to gardens of Latium during the Renaissance', Journal of garden history, II,3 (1982), pp. 201-32.
- Colombo, A., 'Il monastero e la chiesa di Santa Maria della Sapienza', Napoli Nobilissima, X (1901), pp. 145-000.
- A concise encyclopaedia of the Italian Renaissance, edited by J. R. Hale, London, 1981.
- Cosenza, M. E., Biographical and bibliographical dictionary of the Italian humanists and of the world of classical scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800, 6 vols., 2nd ed., Boston, 1962, Supplement, 1967.
- Covi, D., 'Lettering in fifteenth-century Florentine painting', Art Bulletin, XLV (1963), pp. 1-17.
- Crema, L., and S. Malaton, 'La Cappella di San Tommaso d'Aquino nel Sant'Eustorgio', Bollettino d'arte, XLIV (1959), pp. 114-21.
- Creytens, R., 'Le "Studium Romanae Curiae" et le Maître du Sacré Palais', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XII (1942), pp. 1-83.
- Cumont, F., Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains, Paris, 1942.
- Dacos, N., La découverte de la Domus Aurea et la formation des grotesques à la Renaissance, Studies of the Warburg Institute, vol. 31, London, 1969.
- D'Agostino, G., La capitale ambigua: Napoli dal 1458 al 1580, Naples, 1979.
- D'Amato, A., 'Gli atti dei capitoli generali del 1474 e del 1486 e altri frammenti', Achivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XVII (1947), pp. 221-49.

_____, 'Sull'introduzione della riforma domenicana nel Napolitano per opera della congregazione Lombarda (1489-1501)', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XXVI (1956), pp. 249-75.

D'Amico, J. F., Renaissance humanism in papal Rome, Baltimore and London, 1983.

D'Engenio, C., Napoli sacra, Naples, 1623.

Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, 15 vols., edited by F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, Paris, 1907-53.

Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, 15 vols. in 30, edited by A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amann, Paris, 1915-1950.

Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, Rome, 1960-.

Doria, G., ed., I palazzi di Napoli, Naples, 1986.

Douglas, R. M., Jacopo Sadoleto, 1477-1547, humanist and reformer, Cambridge, Mass., 1959.

Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti, 4th ed., 36 vols., Rome, 1929-39.

Ettlinger, L. D., 'Pollaiuolo's tomb of Pope Sixtus IV', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XVI (1953), pp. 239-74.

_____, The Sistine chapel before Michelangelo, Oxford-Warburg Studies, Oxford, 1965.

_____, Antonio and Piero Pollaiuolo, Oxford, 1978.

Eubel, C., Hierarchia catholica Medii Aevi, Vols. II-III, Regensburg, 1901-10.

Evennett, H. O., The spirit of the Counter-Reformation, edited by J. Bossy, Cambridge, 1968.

Fehl, P., 'The placement of the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius in the Middle Ages', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXVII (1974), pp. 362-7.

Ferino, Pagden, S., Disegni umbri del Rinascimento da Perugino a Raffaello, Florence, 1982.

Forte, S. L., The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order, Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum Romae ad Sanctae Sabinae, Dissertationes historicae, XV, Rome, 1959.

Fossi-Todorow, M., Mostra di disegni di Filippino Lippi e Piero di Cosimo, Florence, 1955.

Friedman, D., 'The burial chapel of Filippo Strozzi in Santa Maria Novella in Florence', L'Arte, IX (1970), pp. 108-31.

Frizzoni, G., Arte italiana del Rinascimento: saggi critici, Milan, 1891.

Frutaz, A. P., Le piante di Roma, 3 vols., Rome, 1962.

_____, 'Inventarium librorum monasterii Pacis de Urbe 1484' in Studi in onore di Leopoldo Sandri, Vol. II, pp. 491-514, Rome, 1983.

Galante, G. A., Guida sacra della Città di Napoli, Naples, 1872.

_____, La tribuna del Duomo di Napoli, Naples, 1874.

Gamba, F., Filippino Lippi nella storia della critica, Florence, 1958.

Gardner, J., 'Andrea di Bonaiuto and the chapterhouse frescoes in Santa Maria Novella', Art History, II (1979), pp. 107-138.

Geiger, G. L., 'Filippino Lippi's Carafa Annunciation: theology, artistic conventions and patronage', Art Bulletin, LXIII (1981), pp. 62-75.

_____, 'Filippino Lippi's Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas', in Rome in the Renaissance: the city and the myth, pp. 224-36, edited by P.A. Ramsey, Binghampton, N.Y., 1982.

_____, 'Filippino Lippi's Wunder des heiligen Thomas von Aquin im Rom des späten Quattrocento', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XLVII (1984), pp. 247-60.

_____, Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel: Renaissance art in Rome, Sixteenth century essays and studies, vol. 5, Kirksville, MO., 1988.

Gnoli, D., 'Storia di Pasquino dalle origini al Sacco del Borbone', Nuova antologia, XXV (1890), pp. 51-75, 275-96.

_____, La Roma di Leon X, pp. 136-184, 300-308, edited by A. Gnoli, Milan, 1938.

Gombrich, E. H., 'The early Medici as patrons of art: a survey of primary sources', in Italian Renaissance studies: a tribute to the late Cecilia M. Ady, pp. 279-311, edited by E. F. Jacob, London, 1960, reprinted in Norm and form: studies in the art of the Renaissance, pp. 35-57, London, 1966.

Gregori, L. de, Del chiostro della Minerva e del primo libro con figure stampato in Italia, Florence, 1927.

Guglielmotti, A., Storia della marina pontificia nel Medio Evo. dal 728 al 1499, Vol. II, Rome, 1886.

Hall, E., and H. Uhr, 'Aureola super Auream: crowns and related symbols of special distinction in late Gothic and Renaissance iconography', Art Bulletin, LXVII (1985), pp. 567-603.

Hallman, M^cClung, B., Italian cardinals: reform and the Church as property, Berkeley, 1985.

Halm, P., 'Das unvollendete Fresko des Filippino Lippi in Poggio a Cajano', Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz, III, 7, (1931), pp. 393-427.

Hartt, F., G. Corti, and C. Kennedy, The chapel of the Cardinal of Portugal, 1434-1459, at San Miniato in Florence, Philadelphia, 1964.

Haskell, F., and N. Penny, Taste and the antique: the lure of classical sculpture, 1500-1900, New Haven and London, 1981.

Hay, D., 'The Renaissance cardinals: Church, state, culture', Synthesis, III (1976), pp. 35-46.

_____, The Church in Italy in the fifteenth century, Cambridge, 1977.

Hedberg, G., 'Antoniazio Romano and his school', dissertation in fine arts, New York University, 1980.

Hersey, G. L., Alfonso II and the artistic renewal in Naples, 1485-1495, New Haven, 1969.

Heydenreich, L. H., and W. Lotz, Architecture in Italy: 1400 to 1600, translated by M. Hottinger, The Pelican history of art, Harmondsworth, 1974.

Hill, G. F., A corpus of Italian medals of the Renaissance before Cellini, 2 vols., London, 1930.

Hinnebusch, W. A., The history of the Dominican Order, 2 vols., New York, 1966-73.

Hood, W., 'Saint Dominic's manner of praying, gestures in Fra Angelico's cell frescoes at San Marco', Art Bulletin, LXVIII (1986), pp. 195-206.

Hope, C., 'Artists, patrons and their advisers in the Italian Renaissance', in Patronage in the Renaissance (see below), pp. 293-343.

Horster, M., Andrea del Castagno, Oxford, 1980.

Howe, E. D., The hospital of Santo Spirito and Pope Sixtus IV, New York, 1978.

Hülßen, C., Römische Antikengärten des XVI. Jahrhunderts, Heidelberg, 1917.

Janson, H. W., The sculpture of Donatello, 2 vols., Princeton, 1957.

- Jenkins, A. D. Fraser, 'Cosimo de' Medici's patronage of architecture and the theory of magnificence', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXXIII (1970), pp. 162-70.
- Kaeppli, T., Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi, 3 vols., Rome, 1970-80.
- Kaftal, G., Iconography of the saints in Tuscan painting, Florence, 1952.
- _____, Iconography of the saints in Central and South Italian painting, Florence, 1965.
- _____, Iconography of the saints in the painting of North East Italy, Florence, 1978.
- _____, and F. Bisogni, Iconography of the saints in the painting of North West Italy, Florence, 1985.
- Krautheimer, R., et. al., Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae: le basiliche cristiane antiche di Roma, 5 vols., Città del Vaticano, 1937-77.
- Kristeller, P. O., Renaissance thought: the classic, scholastic and humanistic strains, rev.ed., New York, 1961.
- _____, Iter Italicum, 3 vols., London, 1963-.
- _____, 'A Thomist critique of Marsilio Ficino's theory of will and intellect', in Henry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee volume, pp. 463-94, Jerusalem, 1965.
- Ladner, G., 'Vegetation symbolism and the concept of the Renaissance', in De artibus opuscula XL: essays in honor of Erwin Panofsky, Vol. 1, pp. 303-22, edited by M. Meiss, New York, 1961.
- Lanciani, R., Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità, 4 vols., Rome, 1902-12.
- Lavagnino, E., 'I lavori di ripristino della basilica di San Gennaro extra moenia a Napoli', Bollettino d'arte, n.s., VIII (1928-29), pp. 145-66.
- _____, 'Osservazioni sulla topografia della catacomba di San Gennaro extra moenia a Napoli', Bollettino d'arte, n.s., IX (1929-30), pp. 337-54.
- Lee, E., Sixtus IV and men of letters, Rome, 1978.
- Lellis, C. de, Aggiunta alla Napoli sacra del D'Engenio, edited by F. Aceto, Naples, 1977.
- Letarouilly, P., édifices de Rome moderne, ou recueil des palais, maisons, églises, couvents et autres monuments, 3 vols., Paris, 1868-74.

- Lightbown, R. W., Donatello and Michelozzo: an artistic partnership and its patrons in the early Renaissance, 2 vols., London, 1980.
- Litta, P., et. al., Famiglie celebri di Italia, 11 vols., Milan, Turin, 1819-99, Serie 2, Turin, 1902-23.
- Luzio, A., 'Federico Gonzaga ostaggio alla corte di Giulio II', Archivio della Reale Società Romana di storia patria, IX (1886), pp. 509-82.
- M^cManamon, J. M., 'The ideal Renaissance pope: funeral oratory from the papal court', Archivum historiae Pontificae, XIV (1976), pp. 9-70.
- Magnuson, T., Studies in Roman quattrocento architecture, Stockholm, 1958.
- Maio, R. de, Le origini del Seminario di Napoli: contributo alla storia napoletana del Cinquecento, Naples, 1958.
- _____, 'Savonarola, Oliviero Carafa, Tommaso de Vio e la Disputa di Raffaello', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, XXXVIII (1968), pp. 149-64.
- _____, Savonarola e la Curia romana, Rome, 1969.
- Mallett, M., The Borgias: the rise and fall of a Renaissance dynasty, London, 1967.
- Malmstrom, R. E., 'S. Maria in Aracoeli at Rome', PhD. dissertation, New York University, 1973.
- Marchini, G., Filippo Lippi, Milan, 1975.
- Marconi, P., 'Il chiostro di S. Maria della Pace in Roma', pp. 427-36, Studi Bramanteschi, Rome, 1974.
- Marinis, T. de, La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona, 4 vols., Milan, 1947-1952.
- _____, La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona: supplemento, 2 vols., Verona, 1969.
- Meiss, M., 'The problem of Francesco Traini', Art Bulletin, XV (1933), pp. 97-173.
- Miola, A., 'Il Succorpo di San Gennaro descritto da un frate del quattrocento', Napoli Nobilissima, VI (1897), pp. 161-66, 180-8.
- Moore, J. D., 'New light on Diomede Carafa and his "perfect loyalty" to Ferrante of Aragon', Italian Studies, XXVI (1971), pp. 1-23.
- Morisani, O., Saggi sulla scultura napoletana del cinquecento, Naples, 1941.
- Morpurgo-Castelnuovo, M., 'Il Cardinale Domenico Capranica', Archivio della Reale Società Romana di storia patria, LII (1929), pp. 1-146.

Mortier, D.A., Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'Ordre des frères prêcheurs, 8 vols. in 7, Paris, 1903-20.

Muñoz, A., 'Studi sulla scultura napoletana del Rinascimento I: Tommaso Malvito da Como e suo figlio Gian Tommaso', Bollettino d'arte III (1909), pp. 55-73, 83-101.

Munrow, D., Instruments of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, Oxford, 1976.

Müntz, E., Les arts à la cour des papes pendant le XV^e et le XVI^e siècle: recueil de documents inédits tirés des archives et des bibliothèques romaines, 3 vols., Paris, 1878-82.

Neilson, K. B., Filippino Lippi: a critical study, Cambridge, Mass., 1938.

Noehles, G., 'Antoniazio Romano: Studien zur Quattrocento Malerei in Rom', PhD. dissertation, Münster, 1973.

Norman, D., 'The Succorpo in the cathedral of Naples: "empress of all chapels"', Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, XLIX (1986), pp. 323-355.

_____, 'The library of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', The Book Collector, XXXVI (1987), pp. 354-371, 471-490.

_____, 'Case studies in interpretation: a Dominican chapel and a Franciscan church', review essay of Filippino Lippi's Carafa chapel: Renaissance art in Rome by G. L. Geiger (see above), and Piety and patronage in Renaissance Venice: Bellini, Titian and the Franciscans, by R. Goffen, Art History, X (1987), pp. 523-541.

_____, 'Carafa family', The Dictionary of Art (companion to The New Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians), (forthcoming).

_____, 'Oliviero Carafa', The Dictionary of Art (companion to The New Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians), (forthcoming).

O'Malley, J. W., Giles of Viterbo on church and reform: a study in Renaissance thought, Leiden, 1968.

_____, 'Preaching for the popes', in The pursuit of holiness in late Medieval and Renaissance religion, pp. 408-440, edited by C. Trinkaus and H. O. Oberman, Leiden, 1974.

_____, 'Some Renaissance panegyrics of Aquinas', Renaissance Quarterly, XXVII (1974), pp. 174-92.

_____, Praise and blame in Renaissance Rome: rhetoric, doctrine and reform in the sacred orators of the papal court, c.1450-1521, Durham, N.C., 1979.

_____, 'The feast of Thomas Aquinas in Renaissance Rome: a neglected document and its import', Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, XXXV (1981), pp. 1-27.

Palazzo Braschi e il suo ambiente, edited by C. Pietrangeli and A. Ravaglioli, Rome, 1967.

Paliotti, V., San Gennaro: storia di un culto, di un mito, dell'anima di un popolo, Milan, 1983.

Pane, R., Architettura del Rinascimento in Napoli, Naples, 1937.

_____, Il Rinascimento nell'Italia meridionale, 2 vols., Milan, 1975-1977.

_____, et. al., Il centro antico di Napoli, 3 vols., Naples, 1971.

Parascondolo, L., Memorie storiche-critiche-diplomatiche della chiesa di Napoli, 5 vols., Naples, 1847-54.

Partner, P., 'The "budget" of the Roman Church in the Renaissance period', in Italian Renaissance Studies: a tribute to the late Cecilia Ady, pp. 256-78, edited by E. F. Jacob, London, 1960.

_____, Renaissance Rome, 1500-1559: a portrait of a society, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976.

_____, 'Papal financial policy in the Renaissance and Counter-Reformation', Past and Present, LXXXVIII (1980), pp. 17-62.

Pastor, L. von, History of the Popes, translated by F. Antrobus, et. al., 40 vols., 6th ed., London, 1968-9.

Patronage, art, and society in Renaissance Italy (Papers from a conference, Melbourne, 1983), edited by F. W. Kent and P. Simons, Canberra, 1987.

Patronage in the Renaissance (Folger Institute Symposium, 1977), edited by G. Fitch Lytle and S. Orgel, Princeton, N. J., 1981.

Persico, M., Diomede Carafa, uomo di stato e scrittore del secolo XV, Naples, 1899.

Petrucchi, A., 'Oliviero Carafa', Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, Vol. XIX, pp. 588-96.

_____, 'Per un'edizione critica dei Memoriali di Diomede Carafa: problemi e metodo', Archivio storico per le province napoletane, ser. 4, XV (1976), pp. 213-34.

Picotti, G. B., La giovinezza di Leone X, Milan, 1928.

_____, 'Nuovi studi e documenti intorno a papa Alessandro VI', Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, V (1951), pp. 185-207.

Pietrangeli, C., 'Storia del Palazzo: Palazzo Orsini a Pasquino e Palazzo Braschi', in Palazzo Braschi (above), pp. 33-56.

Pontieri, E., Per la storia del regno di Ferrante I d'Aragona re di Napoli, 2nd ed., revised, Naples, 1969.

Pope-Hennessy, J., Italian Renaissance sculpture: an introduction to Italian sculpture, part 2 of 3 parts, 2nd ed., London, 1971.

Popham, A.E., and P. Pouncey, Italian drawings in . . . the British Museum: the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, 2 vols., London, 1950-.

Pouncey, P., Review of I disegni dei pittori fiorentini by B. Berenson, in Master drawings, II (1964), pp. 278-93.

Quétif, J., and J. Echard, eds., Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum, 2 vols., Paris, 1719-23.

Regio, P., Le vite de'sette Santi Protettori di Napoli, Naples, 1579.

Respighi, L., 'Il chiostro domenicana della Cisterna alla Minerva in Roma', Bollettino d'arte, n.s. II (1923-24), pp. 23-37.

Reynolds, A., 'The private and public emblems of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa', Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XLV (1983), pp. 273-84.

_____, 'Cardinal Oliviero Carafa and the early cinquecento tradition of the feast of Pasquino', Humanistica Lovaniensia, XXXIV (1985), pp. 178-208.

Ricci, C., 'Il chiostro della Pace', Nuova antologia, I (1915), pp. 361-67.

Roscoe, W., Life and pontificate of Leo X, 2 vols., London, 1846.

Rumpf, A., Die Meerwesen auf den antiken Sarkophagreliefs, Berlin, 1939.

Ryder, A., The kingdom of Naples under Alfonso the Magnanimous: the making of a modern state, Oxford, 1976.

Sala, T., Dizionario storico biografico di scrittori, letterati ed artisti dell'Ordine di Vallombrosa, 2 vols., Florence, 1927-37.

Sale, J. Russell, Filippino Lippi's Strozzi chapel in Santa Maria Novella, New York, 1979.

Sandström, S., 'The programme for the decoration of the Belvedere of Innocent VIII', Konsthistorisk Tidskrift, XXIX (1960), pp. 35-75.

_____, Levels of unreality: studies in structure and construction in Italian mural painting during the Renaissance, Uppsala, 1963.

- Sarnelli, P., Guida de'forestieri, curiosi di vedere, ed'intendere le cose più notabili della regal città di Napoli, e del suo amenissimo distretto, Naples, 1688.
- Saxl, F., 'Pagan sacrifice in the Italian Renaissance', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, II (1938-9), pp. 346-67.
- _____, 'The classical inscription in Renaissance art and politics', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, I (1940-1), pp. 19-46.
- Scandone, F., 'I Carafa di Napoli', in P. Litta, Famiglie celebri italiane (see above), 2nd series, I, tav. XIX, Turin, 1913.
- Scarpellini, P., Perugino, Milan, 1984.
- Scharf, A., Filippino Lippi, Vienna, 1950.
- Schiavo, A., 'Il chiostro di Santa Maria della Pace', Palatino, n.s. IV (1960), pp. 103-5.
- Schrader, L., Monumentorum Italiae, Helmstadt, 1592.
- Schudt, L., ed., Le guide di Roma, Vienna and Augsburg, 1930.
- Schweitzer, B., 'Die Menelaus-Patroklos-Gruppe: ein verlorenes Meisterwerk hellenistischer Kunst', Die Antike, XIV (1938), pp. 43-72.
- Seta, C. de, Napoli, 2nd ed., Rome, 1984.
- Setton, K. M., The papacy and the Levant (1204-1571), 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1976-84.
- Seymour, C., Sculpture in Italy, 1400 to 1500, Pelican history of art, Harmondsworth, 1966.
- Shoemaker, I. H., 'Filippino Lippi as a draughtsman', PhD. dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.
- Simpson, W. A., 'Cardinal Giovanni Orsini as a prince of the Church and patron of the arts', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXIX (1966), pp. 135-159.
- Stefano, P. de, Descrittione dei luoghi sacri della città di Napoli, Naples, 1560.
- Stefano, R. di, La cattedrale di Napoli: storia, restauro, scoperte, ritrovamenti, Naples, 2nd ed., 1975.
- Stinger, C. L., Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) and Christian antiquity in the Italian Renaissance, Albany, N.Y., 1977.
- _____, The Renaissance in Rome, Bloomington, Ind., 1985.

Strazzullo, F., 'Le vicende dell'abside del Duomo di Napoli', in Studi in onore di Domenico Mallardo, Naples, 1957.

_____, Saggi storici sul Duomo di Napoli, Naples, 1959.

_____, 'Il Card. Oliviero Carafa mecenate del Rinascimento', Atti della Accademia Pontaniana, N.S. XIV (1964-5), pp. 139-61.

_____, 'La Cappella Carafa del Duomo di Napoli in un poemetto del primo cinquecento', Napoli Nobilissima, V (1966), pp. 59-71.

_____, 'La politica di Ferrante I nei riflessi della translazione della ossa di S Gennaro', Atti della Accademia Pontaniana, N.S. XV (1965-6), pp. 73-90.

Summonte, G. A., Dell'istoria della città e Regno di Napoli, 4 vols., Naples, 1602-43.

Thoenes, C., Neapel und Umgebung, 6 vols., Stuttgart, 1971.

Tomei, P., L'architettura a Roma nel Quattrocento, Rome, 1942.

Trinchera, F., Codice Aragonese, 2 vols., Naples, 1866.

Trinklaus, C., Adversity's noblemen: the Italian humanists on happiness, New York, 1965.

_____, In our image and likeness: humanity and divinity in Italian humanist thought, 2 vols., new ed., London, 1970.

Tutini, C., Memorie della vita, miracoli e culto di S. Gennaro martire, vescovo di Benevento e principal protettore della città di Napoli, Naples, 1633, new., ed., G. Pelella, Naples, 1856.

_____, Dell'origine e fundatione de'Seggi di Napoli, 3 vols., Naples, 1644.

Urban, G., 'Die Kirchenbaukunst des Quattrocento in Rom', Römische Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, IX-X (1961-62), pp. 75-287.

Valenti, T., 'Il contratto per l'organo di S. Maria della Pace in Roma', Note d'archivio per la storia musicale, IV (1927), pp. 129-202.

Valle, R. M., and B. Minichini, Descrizione . . . della chiesa del convento e de' religiosi illustri di S Domenico Maggiore di Napoli, Naples, 1854.

Vasaturo, R. N., et. al., Vallombrosa nel IX centenario della morte del fondatore Giovanni Gualberto, Florence, 1973.

Venturi, A., Storia dell'arte italiana, 11 vols., Milan, 1901-40.

Villari, P., La storia di Girolamo Savonarola e de'suoi tempi, 2 vols., new ed., Florence, 1887-8.

Wasserman, J., 'The Quirinal Palace in Rome', Art Bulletin, XC (1963), pp. 205-44.

Weinstein, D., Savonarola and Florence: prophecy and patriotism in the Renaissance, Princeton, 1970.

Weiss, R., 'The Greek culture of South Italy in the later Middle Ages', Proceedings of the British Academy, XXXVII (1951), pp. 23-50.

_____, The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity, Oxford, 1969.

Westfall, C. W., In this most perfect paradise: Alberti, Nicholas V. and the invention of conscious urban planning in Rome, 1447-55, University Park, Pa., 1974.

White, J., Art and architecture in Italy, 1250 to 1400, Pelican history of art, Harmondsworth, 1966.

Widloecher, N., La congregazione dei Canonici Regolari Lateranensi: periodo di formazione, 1402-1483, Gubbio, 1929.

Wind, E., 'Michelangelo's prophets and sibyls', Proceedings of the British Academy, LI (1965), pp. 47-84.

Winternitz, E., Musical instruments and their symbolism in Western art: studies in musical iconology, 2nd ed., New Haven and London, 1979.

Wittkower, R., 'Eagle and serpent: a study in the migration of symbols', Journal of Warburg Institute, II (1938-39), pp. 293-325.

Zigarelli, D. M., Storia di Benevento: biografie dei vescovi e arcivescovi della Chiesa di Napoli, Naples, 1860.

Zucchi, A., 'L'antico convento della Minerva e le trasformazioni dei secoli XVI-XVII', Memorie Domenicane, XLIII, new series II-III (1967), pp. 144-162.